The Life of Francis Turretin (1623-87) and His Impact on the Protestant Reformed Tradition

Cumming, Nicholas Andrew

Awarding institution:
King's College London

The Life of Francis Turretin (1623-87)

and His Impact on the Protestant Reformed Tradition

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy: Theology and Religious Studies, King's College London, by Nicholas A. Cumming

Abstract

This thesis studies the life, writings, and impact of the Protestant Reformed minister and theologian Francis Turretin (1623-87). Turretin was born, educated, and worked in the influential city of Geneva during a tumultuous period. Of primary concern is Turretin's publications and ministry within the context of his life, the situation of seventeenth-century Geneva, and the religious turmoil of Early Modern Europe. Analysis of Turretin's life is scant, with no new research carried out in the twentieth or twenty-first centuries. This study, then, re-contextualises the life and work of Turretin, with the broader goal of filling-in, to a degree, the history of Early Modern Protestantism through new, original research of archival and published materials.

The thesis comprises seven chapters that are ordered first, by situating the political and ecclesiastical endeavours of the city of Geneva within its historical and historiographical framework, then by examining the life of Turretin in particular. With the historical context firmly in place, the thesis then moves on to analysis of Turretin's most influential work, *The Institutes of Elenctic Theology* (1679-85). What is especially important to this chapter is Turretin's identification as 'one amongst the Reformed' in terms of history and theology. Historically, Turretin understood himself to be in a long line of 'orthodox' theologians, from the Reformation *and* pre-Reformation Church, and he believed that his theology was congruent with the Evangelical movement begun with Jean Calvin (1509-64). By analysing Turretin's soteriology in light of Calvin's, not least the theology of predestination, and the theological situation of Early Modern Europe, this thesis argues that Turretin's ideas *did* stand alongside established Reformed thought from

Calvin's time to the seventeenth century. Moving on from the *Institutes*, then, the thesis analyses Turretin's disputations, sermons, and his work on the *Helvetic Formula Consensus* (1675). Finally, the body of the thesis concludes with an examination of Turretin's posthumous impact.

Ultimately, this thesis argues that, significantly, Turretin's work stood in clear continuity with the theology of the Reformed since Calvin. Though this thesis does not seek to make Calvin the only *font* for theology in the Reformed Tradition, due to the polemical and confessional nature of twentieth-century historiography, it was necessary to re-examine this influential theologian within his historical context without the confines of modern ecclesiastical boundaries. The original contribution to research that this study provides is the examination of Turretin's life, correspondence, theology, and ministry in the light of Early Modern Christian history and with an eye towards its development in the modern period.

Acknowledgments

As with any endeavour of this magnitude, it is difficult to enumerate fully the amount of gratitude due. First, I thank the librarians and archivists at the Maughan Library of King's College London, the Bibliothèque Publique et Universitaire at the University of Geneva, and the Archives d'Etat of Geneva. I am extremely grateful for their work on my behalf, especially in Geneva where my spoken French was wholly inadequate. Special thanks are due to the excellent staff at the British Library. The lion's share of this thesis was done in the Rare Books and Music Reading Room, where the librarians were more than willing to come to my aid. I am thankful for their hospitality, which was second-to-none.

The desire to do this research came, primarily, through my professors at Pepperdine University in Malibu, California. In particular, I am thankful to Professor Ron Highfield for helping me love theology and Dr Dyron Daughrity for teaching me to appreciate history. Dr Daughrity, especially spurred on my intellectual endeavours and continues to be a valued ally, for which I am extremely thankful. Dr Susannah Ticciati of King's College London has been an invaluable help in making this thesis better. Her insight and theological knowledge was intrinsic in making the theological sections clearer and more concise. This thesis, however, would have never seen the light of day without the encouragement, wisdom, and criticism of Dr David Crankshaw of King's College London. It is no stretch to say that Dr Crankshaw's keen observations, attention to detail, and immense scholarship made this thesis possible. Though all mistakes are mine alone,

I am convinced that anything of worth in this thesis is due to his guidance and intellect. I am very thankful to have had him as my supervisor.

I am also grateful to have had the opportunity to present this research in progress at the Euorpean History 1500-1800 Seminar at the Institute of Historical Research, University of London and at the American Society of Church History 2016 Spring Conference in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. The feedback I gained improved my drafts considerably and their encouragement was much needed. King's College London's Faculty of Arts and Humanities was very generous in granting me funding for the archival research in Geneva and for travel to the ASCH conference. I am honoured that the College was willing to invest in me and this research.

Finally, thanks are due to my family. First, to my parents and in-laws for their support, especially in our move to England. Second, to my daughter, Della, whose life began as the thesis came to its end. Lastly, to my wife, Kristen, who moved from Los Angeles to London to support this undertaking. I, and this thesis, owe a debt to you that can never be repaid. Like Turretin, though, this "little work's" dedication is to the Church and work of God. Echoing the final words of Turretin's *Institutes*, "And to thee, the everlasting King, the only wise God, immortal, invisible, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, adorable Trinity, be honour and glory, for ever and ever. Amen."

Contents

Abbreviations

AEG	*Archives d'État de Genève*
Amyraut Heresy	B. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth Century France* (Madison, WI, 1969).
BPL	*Biblioteca Publica Latina, Universiteitsbibliotheek Leiden*
BPU	*Biblioteque Publique et Universitaire de Genéve*
Calvinism in Europe	A. Pettegree, *et al.* (eds), *Calvinism in Europe, 1540-1620* (Cambridge, 1994).
Companion to Calvin	D. K. McKim (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to John Calvin* (New York, NY, 2004).
EC Rép.	*Repertoires de État Civil de Genève*
EO	*Ordinances Ecclesiastiques de Genève, 1541*
Université Genève	C. Borgeaud, *Histoire de l'Université de Genève* (4 vols, Geneva, *de* 1900).
Histoire Genève	J. A. Gautier, *Histoire de Genève* (2 vols, Lyons, 1730).
International Calvinism	M. Prestwich (ed.), *International Calvinism, 1541-1715* (Oxford, 1985).
Christian Religion	J. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (trans. H. Beveridge, Peabody, MA, 2008).
Elenctic Theology	F. Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* (Phillipsburg, PA, 1992).
PH	*Pièces Historiques, Archives d'État de Genève*
Protestant Scholasticism	C. Trueman and R. S. Clark (eds), *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Milton Keynes, 1999).

PRRD	R. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725* (4 vols, Grand Rapids, MI, 1987-93).
RCons.	*Registres de la Consistoire de Genève*
RCP	*Registres de la Compagnie des Pasteurs de Genève*
ST	T. Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* (3 vols, London, 1955).
UB	*Universiteitsbibliotheek Leiden*
Vie Turretini	E. de Budé, *Vie de François Turretini, Theologien Genevois, 1623-1687* (Lausanne, 1871).

Notes on Conventions

Quotations from primary sources are left in their original spelling. This is particularly pertinent to the spelling of the French documents, but also pertains to some English documents. Primarily, this means that certain words in Early Modern French and English contain extra letters in their orthography. In addition, I have not Anglicised the writings of American authors or writings that employ American English (i.e. secondary sources translated to American English which were originally in other languages). Capitalisation and punctuation have also been left in the original formatting of the author, whether Early Modern or Modern.

All dates are given according to the New Style Calendar, which has a ten-day variance with the Old Style. Though Geneva did not adopt the New Style until 1701,[1] fourteen years after Turretin's death, the documents of the councils of Geneva are organised by New Style standards, marking January 1 as the beginning of the year and, thus, the beginning of a new council term. Therefore, in order to avoid confusion and to follow the format of the seventeenth-century Genevans, the year begins on January 1. In the Old Style, the Year of Grace usually began on March 25 in Early Modern Europe, though a move towards January 1 was in favour. After the adoption of the New Style Calendar, January 1 was finally adopted as the beginning of the year. The Catholic nations of Europe started utilising the New Style in 1582, making it even more difficult

[1] S. Manetsch, *Theodore Beza and the Quest for Peace in France: 1572-1598* (Leiden, 2000), p. 123.

for the Protestant nations to change, especially as the New Style was considered more scientifically accurate, even by Protestants.[2]

Finally, there are a few citation abbreviations detailed on pages eight and nine. All other citations give author, title, and place and date of publication. This is consistent throughout except for Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologica* which is traditionally cited according to the place within the work. Therefore, all *Summa* citations are abbreviated *ST* and ordered by part, question, article, and objection. For instance, if citing part I, question one, article 1, objection 1, the citation will read: *ST* I, q. 1, a. 1, ad. 1. This allows for quick research across *Summa* editions, which may differ by page content and numbering.

[2] J. P. McNutt, "Hesitant Steps: Acceptance of the Gregorian Calendar in Eighteenth-Century Geneva," *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture*, 75 (2006), pp. 544-64.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Since the Reformation, historians and theologians have attempted, with various degrees of success, to define what it means to be a 'Protestant.' Many monographs, articles, and chapters have been devoted to understanding the unique place Protestantism has in the history of Christianity.[3] Starting from the general and moving into the specific, scholars have begun to understand the various traditions that emerged after Luther's original protest in 1517, though the term 'Protestant' originated in 1529. This task has expanded in the last hundred years in order properly to appreciate the assorted ideas, events, ministers, theologians, and social movements that developed as Christianity began to fracture. As Reformation studies continued to develop, more nuanced and refined interpretations emerged. One of the most notable traditions is what has become known as the Reformed Tradition.[4] More colloquially referred to as 'Calvinism', this particular brand of Christianity has been studied extensively since the nineteenth century. Though well researched, the question must be asked: how has the Reformed Tradition been defined? What are the presuppositions in scholarship? How has the tradition distinguished itself from other Christian traditions? In general, what can we say with confidence about the Reformed Tradition and its development in comparison with other Protestant traditions? These questions have been analysed extensively in scholarship, but there remain some gaps that need to be filled. This review will examine trends in

---

[3] Some recent popular monographs are Alister McGrath, *Christianity's Dangerous Idea*: *The Protestant Revolution—a History from the Sixteenth Century to the Twenty-First* (New York, NY, 2007), and Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Reformation* (New York, NY, 2004).

[4] From this point on I will refer to this tradition as 'Reformed' as opposed to 'Calvinist' or 'Calvinism', unless I am referring to another author's use of the latter terms.

historiography and come to some conclusions about the Reformed Tradition, identify lacunae in the scholarship, and propose new avenues of research. In particular, understanding the Reformed Tradition will help us place Francis Turretin (1623-87) in his historical context, discern his impact on the Tradition during his life, and recognize how he impacted the movement, overall. This is what this research will attempt to understand: what was the impact of Francis Turretin on the Protestant Reformed Tradition?

The origins of the Reformed Tradition have commonly been associated with the minister and theologian John Calvin (1509-64). Born immediately before the dawn of the Reformation, Calvin was a highly educated and well-spoken advocate for the continued transformation of the established church. Calvin's most influential work was his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, first published in Latin in 1536. The *Institutes* were written over the course of Calvin's ministry, constantly being updated and vacillating between being written in Latin and French. The Latin editions were published in 1536 (Basel), 1539 and 43 (Strasbourg), and 1550 and 59 (Geneva); the French publications were in 1541, 45, 51, 53, 54, and 60 all published in Geneva.[5] Calvin's theology, partially found in the *Institutes*, is the primary foundation for what became the study of Reformed theology. Understanding the Reformed Tradition, however, requires that we investigate the historiography concerning both the theology and church polity of this new movement.[6]

---

[5] There was also one Italian edition published in 1557 in Geneva and an English edition published in 1559 in London and translated by Thomas Norton.

[6] Calvin biographies surveyed: W.J. Bouwsma, *John Calvin: A Sixteenth Century Portrait* (New York, NY and Oxford, 1988), P. Helm, *John Calvin's Ideas* (Oxford and New York, NY, 2004), A. Ganoczy, "Calvin's Life," in *Companion to Calvin*, pp. 3-24, T.H.L. Parker, *John Calvin: A Biography* (London, 1975), D. C. Steinmetz, *Calvin in Context* (New York, NY, 1995), F. Wendel, *Calvin: The Origins and*

This literature review has chosen to examine the impact of Francis Turretin starting with the broad aspects of his tradition and moving on to the specific. In order properly to situation Turretin one must understand his place historically, geographically, politically, and socially alongside his influence as a theologian. In this case, then, it is necessary to begin by understanding the full history and historiography of the Reformed Tradition both theologically and historically. How did the Reformed Tradition change Early Modern Europe? Progressing to the more specific, one must chronicle the part the canton of Geneva played in the development and spread of the Reformed Tradition and the role of Reformed theology and polity in the evolution of the city. Finally, these two broader topics will transition into the specific role of Turretin in the Reformed Tradition, the city of Geneva, and his posthumous legacy. Ultimately, this literature review will exemplify the overall research question, what was the impact of Francis Turretin on the Protestant Reformed Tradition?

I. Reformed Theology

Since the beginning of the twentieth century much scholarly time and energy has been invested in understanding the theology of the Reformers. Beginning with Luther in Wittenberg and continuing with Calvin and Geneva, historians and theologians have pored over the texts of sixteenth and seventeenth-century theologians in order to understand what differentiates the traditions. Unlike Luther, who did not write a 'systematic theology,' Calvin presented a well-organized and widely published theology that could be readily examined. In addition, because Calvin updated and edited his

---

Development of His Thought (trans. by P. Mairet; New York, NY, 1963), and R. Zachman, *John Calvin as Pastor, Teacher and Theologian: The Shape of His Writings and Thought* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2006).

volumes scholars have been able to understand the intellectual development of Calvin and the legacy that he left for his successors. In twentieth-century scholarship on Calvin, his successors and the Reformed Tradition developed drastically. One of the earliest interpretations concerning the development of the Reformed Tradition was proposed by Basil Hall.[7] Hall asserted that Calvin would have been at odds with those who followed after him in both theology and church governance. He uses Theodore Beza (1519-1605) and William Perkins (1558-1602) as his examples and he concludes, "Those who followed him and had some effective claim to be his successors, men like Théodore de Beze, altered that careful balance in order to meet new needs or because they never fully accepted or appreciated the whole range of Calvin's thought".[8] He was not alone in this endeavour, however, and much of the prevailing consensus concerned the divergent theologies of John Calvin and future 'Calvinists.'[9]

Hall's question was "what is Calvinism?" This continues to be an important question because how one answers it shapes how he or she sees the tradition and its development. For Hall, the answer was the "careful *balance* of his theological doctrines and his organization of the Genevan Church in relation to the civil power, which constitutes what properly should be called 'Calvinism.'"[10] Hall, however, does not provide the correct proportion of theology and church polity needed in order to maintain this "balance", though he postulates that Calvin's measurement would have been first scripture, then secondarily tradition, followed by good reason.[11] He argues that much contemporary

---

[7] B. Hall, "Calvin Against the Calvinists," in G.E. Duffield (ed.), *John Calvin* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1966), pp. 19-37.
[8] *Ibid*., p. 20.
[9] See *Amyraut Heresy*.
[10] Hall, "Calvin," pp. 19-20. My emphasis.
[11] *Ibid*., p. 20.

scholarship focused too much on one issue or the other: Anglicans accepting Calvin's theology while ignoring his ecclesiology; Lutherans placing undue stress on Calvin's doctrine of predestination, treating it like Luther's doctrine of justification; and Barthians producing a Calvin who agrees with Barth. Hall makes an important point here because he shows that much scholarship during the twentieth century into Calvin's origins was carried out with certain presuppositions; they did not allow Calvin to speak for himself.[12]

Hall continues his argument by examining how succeeding Calvinists 'distorted' Calvin's careful balance. His primary examples are the Englishman William Perkins and Calvin's immediate successor in Geneva, Theodore Beza. Hall rests his case on the renewed Aristotelianism of Beza and his, seeming, movement away from biblical theology. Hall charges that Beza's overloaded scholasticism tipped the scales of Calvin's balance so much that he went well beyond Calvin's initial intentions. One of Hall's major premises is that Beza denied episcopacy in favour of Presbyterianism, something Calvin would not have done. By doing so, Beza 'distorted' Calvin's work of balance in favour of rigidity. In regards to Perkins, Hall, again, proposes that "with Perkins we can see, as with Beza, a more severe, more speculative and less biblical version of the doctrine of grace lacking Calvin's attempt to give it Christocentric emphasis."[13] Hall betrays his own thesis here, though, as he begins to place a certain presupposing doctrine onto Calvin's theology. In his previous section Hall scolded those theologians who had

---

[12] Hall, however, does not give any cited evidence for his assertion. In 1963 Francois Wendel proposed a Calvin who was at peace with the supposed 'paradoxes' of theology, not placing a centre locus at all and instead allowing scripture to speak for itself. Wendel does, however, argue that Calvin may have done more proof texting for presupposed beliefs than allowing a pure biblical theology. See Wendel, *Calvin*, pp. 358-9.

[13] Hall, "Calvin," p. 29.

placed inordinate amount of weight on Calvin's doctrine of predestination, but here he is doing the same injustice with Calvin's doctrine of Christ.

Ultimately, Hall's thesis hinges on later Reformed theologians' appeal to Calvin. For Hall's premise to work, late sixteenth and seventeenth-century theologians needed knowingly to appeal to Calvin while simultaneously misunderstanding his theology. Brian Armstrong picked up this thread in the late 1960s.[14] Again, Armstrong stresses the rigidity of the French scholastics in contrast with the more amenable theology of Moses Amyraut (1596-1664). Amyraut was a French theologian at the Academy of Saumur who proposed 'hypothetical universalism': the idea that "God wills the salvation of all men" but it is only efficient for those who believe, and belief is conditional upon God's will that they believe.[15] In other words, salvation is universal because God wills it; however, salvation is only efficacious for those God *also* wills to believe. It is, therefore, simultaneously universal and limited. According to Armstrong, working from Moltmann's conclusions,[16] this apparent contradiction would have been appalling to seventeenth-century 'Calvinists' because it did not precisely, and without discrepancy, outline the Reformed doctrine of predestination as defined in the Synod of Dort.[17] Armstrong, however, concludes that Amyraut's thesis was closer to Calvin's doctrine than the later 'Calvinists.'

Before continuing on to look at Armstrong's argument, it is important to take a step back and understand the importance of the Synod of Dort upon early modern Christian

---

[14] *Amyraut Heresy*.
[15] Amyraut as quoted in *Ibid*., p. 169.
[16] J. Moltmann, "Prädestination und Heilsgeschichte bei Moyse Amyraut," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 65 (1954), pp. 270-303.
[17] *Amyraut Heresy*, p. 170.

history. This Synod had a broad reach due to the implications of the canons not only upon the Reformed, but also upon those who did not adhere to its strict definitions. First, we must understand the history of Synod, why it was called, and what happened after it was ratified.

The Synod of Dort was convened by Dutch Reformed Protestants in 1618 in order to refute the teachings of the Dutch minister and theologian Jacob Arminius (1560-1609). Born just before the death of Calvin, Arminius' legacy is one of deep division. Carl Bangs writes:

> It can be expected that estimates of Arminius and his followers have varied with the sympathies of the observers. One nineteenth-century writer saw him as the greatest of the church's three great theologians. Athanasius understood God, he said; Augustine understood man; Arminius understood the relationship between God and Man. But such Hegelian omniscience is not without its challengers. An English Calvinist who knew how to make it hurt put it succinctly: Arminianism is the religion of common sense; Calvinism is the religion of St. Paul.[18]

As Bangs notes, much of this division can still be seen today in contemporary debates concerning predestination, ecclesiology, and the impact of the Reformation. But what about Arminius' theology caused so much strife? Primarily it dealt with the doctrine of predestination.

Arminius definition of the decrees of salvation differed slightly, yet profoundly, from the prevailing views of the Reformed church. Calvin and his successors divorced foreknowledge from election; that is, according to Reformed theology God predestined every person to either salvation or damnation *before* he created them. Therefore,

---

[18] C. Bangs, *Arminius: A Study in the Dutch Reformation* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1985), p. 18.

salvation could not be based upon any good work a person could do; it was based solely on God's grace. Arminius adjusted predestination in such a way that it re-coupled foreknowledge and individual salvation. Bangs' translation of Arminius' fourth decree of predestination reads:

> From this follows the fourth decree to save certain particular persons and to damn others, which decree rests upon the foreknowledge of God, by which he has known from eternity which persons should believe according to such an administration of the means serving to repentance and faith through his preceding grace and which should persevere through subsequent grace, and also who should not believe and persevere.[19]

Therefore, according to Arminius, one is predestined because God has known that he will believe and this belief results in salvation. In Bangs' estimation "this is where the trouble arises, and from every side."[20]

The Synod was not called simply because Arminius constructed a competing theology, though. It was called because this new theology began to take root on the continent and in England. Nicholas Tyacke's monograph *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c1590-1640* chronicles this development.[21] Tyacke refers to this group as 'anti-Calvinists' because Arminius' writings did not reach English shores until the early seventeenth century. Therefore, they would not have been considered Arminians early on. After the Synod of Dort, however, his name was attached to the movement and it has remained ever since.[22] Tyacke argues that Arminius' theology so

---

[19] *Ibid*., p. 352.
[20] *Ibid*.
[21] N. Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c.1590-1640* (Oxford, 1987).
[22] *Ibid*., p. 4.

extensively refuted Calvinism that his name was attributed to the movement.[23] Tyacke also argues, however, that "indeed, it is not an exaggeration to say that by the end of the sixteenth-century the Church of England was largely Calvinist in doctrine—something which is abundantly illustrated by the publications of the printing press."[24] Therefore, Arminianism posed a direct threat to the theology of late sixteenth-century Anglicanism and the Church of England was a major participant in the Synod.

So what did the Synod say in response to Arminius and his followers? Surprisingly, the Synod denounced Arminianism while simultaneously *not* enshrining the supralapsarian views of the Reformed orthodox.[25] Benedict writes, "Instead, its canons on the divine decrees avoided extensive discussion of reprobation and simply declared that God chose for redemption, of his pure grace before the foundation of the world, a number from within a human race that had fallen of its own fault and was justly condemned to damnation."[26] The Dutch Arminians, known as the Remonstrants due to their fashioning of a remonstrance (complaint) against the states of Holland in 1610, were forbidden to meet together and many were banished from the Netherlands.[27] Nevertheless, they formed a Remonstrant Brotherhood in 1619 and the Brotherhood still exists today.

Needless to say, the Synod of Dort did little to quell any continuing dissention in the Church of England or the Reformed churches of Switzerland and the Netherlands. In

---

[23] *Ibid*.
[24] *Ibid*., p. 3.
[25] Supralapsarianism is the 'highest' form of predestination in Reformed theology. It postulates that God's decrees of reprobation and election are logically prior to God's decree of the fall of man. This view is in contrast to infralapsarianism, which states that God's decree to authorize the fall preceded his decree of reprobation and election. Therefore, under supralapsarianism God decided who would be the elect and the reprobate before he decided to authorize the fall of man through Adam's sin.
[26] P. Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism* (London, 2002), p. 311.
[27] *Ibid*., pp. 307-12.

fact, Benedict argues that Amyraut's theology was due in part to a desire to "accentuate God's mercy yet avoid the errors censured at Dort."[28] The Synod, therefore, is important on two fronts: first, it delineates at least a form of Reformed orthodoxy. One could not be a member of the Reformed Church and believe that man's election rests on God's foreknowledge. Second, since the canons did not systematically and narrowly define Reformed doctrine, they left the door open for future theologians to construct theology that adhered to the Synod, but did not comply with orthodox Reformed theologians. This brings us back to Armstrong's argument concerning Moses Amyraut.

In order to make his case, Armstrong focuses heavily on the change in method from Calvin to seventeenth-century Reformed theologians. Like Hall before him, Armstrong places the blame upon scholasticism: the return to Aristotelian philosophy in theology. He writes: "No longer was the primary approach the analytic and inductive, but rather the synthetic and deductive. Theology was explained not as experienced by man and from his viewpoint but as determined by God and from the perspective of God."[29] The most egregious[30] of these errors came when Beza, Girolamo Zanchi (1516-90), and others placed the doctrine of predestination into the doctrine of God. The doctrine of God attempts to explain in detail what we know about God. Karl Barth writes, "In the doctrine of God we have to learn what we are saying when we say 'God.' In the doctrine of God we have to rightly learn to say 'God' in the correct sense. If we do not speak rightly of this Subject, how can we speak rightly of His predicates?"[31] Therefore, by

---

[28] *Ibid*., p. 316.
[29] *Amyraut Heresy*, p. 136.
[30] Although Armstrong calls it a 'celebrated alteration': *Ibid*.
[31] K. Barth, *Church Dogmatics Volume 2—The Doctrine of God Part I* (4 vols, G. W. Bromiley and T.F. Torrance, eds; Edinburgh, 1957), p. 3.

placing predestination into the doctrine of God one is saying that a part of who God is is his decree to elect and condemn. In Armstrong's estimation, Reformed theologians of the seventeenth century made a major departure from seminal 'Calvinism' which placed predestination in soteriology; that is the doctrine of God's saving work. This altered the method of Calvinism so greatly that it overshadowed all other *loci* and placed predestination on par with God's necessary attributes (i.e. omniscience, omnipresence, etc.).

Continuing this argument, R.T. Kendall argues that Beza and other Heidelberg Theologians (Ursinus, Zanchias, and Olevianus) went beyond Calvin in their doctrines of faith.[32] Kendall presents Beza's doctrine of predestination as a departure from Calvin's. He writes that Beza's major alteration is to make Christ's death limited; that is, instead of Christ's death being for all, but efficacious only on the elect, now Christ *only* died for the elect. Kendall argues that this repositioned salvation away from Christ and on to sanctification. He writes, "Beza directs us not to Christ but to ourselves; we do not begin with Him but with the effects, which points us back, as it were, to the decree of election." Kendall posits that this is in direct opposition to Calvin's theology in which looking to sanctification brings anxiety. By simple reasoning one can know and have assurance in one's salvation.

---

[32] R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (New York, NY, 1979), and *Idem*, "The Puritan Modification of Calvin's Theology," in W.S. Reid (ed.), *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1982), pp. 199-214. Kendall takes a more measured approach in "Puritan Modification" and appropriately acknowledges misappropriation of the term Calvinism, sometimes to theologians who lived pre-Calvin. In addition, while still proposing a 'Calvin vs. the Calvinists' approach, he also rightfully acknowledges the various influences upon English Puritanism. His thesis is that the prevailing 'Calvinism' of late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century Puritanism was really a 'going beyond Calvin' and had more to do with Beza than Calvin and his theology.

Therefore, what we have seen through these three illustrations is that a common thread of scholarship proposed disunity between Calvin and his followers. The Reformed Tradition, therefore, could not, and should not, refer to itself as 'Calvinistic' as Calvin hardly would have assented to their conclusions. There are quite a few presuppositions that these texts assume, however, that may not be correct. The first is whether these theologians, including Beza, Zanchi, Olevianus, Amyraut, Turretin, and others saw their authority as coming from Calvin. This is an important point because if untrue it erodes the premises of Armstrong, Kendall, and Hall. For instance, if Kendall is correct in arguing that Beza, Zanchi, and others would appeal to Calvin as their authority then he is correct in arguing that they *at least* went beyond what Calvin originally wrote. What cannot be known, however, is whether they went beyond what Calvin *intended.* If, however, Beza and others did not view Calvin as the father of their theology, and instead looked to scripture, reason, and a variety of preceding theologians then there cannot be anything called pure 'Calvinism' beyond the works of Calvin himself.

In the latter half of the twentieth century this 'Calvin against the Calvinists' thesis began to be questioned.[33] One of the earliest monographs actively to refute this claim was Paul Helm's *Calvin and the Calvinists*.[34] Helm systematically challenges the theses presented by Kendall and attempts to show how Beza, the Puritans, and the Confessions stem from Calvin's theology. Helm ultimately concludes that it is Kendall who has distorted the views of the Reformed theologians after Calvin. He writes, "In attempting

---

[33] I will show later that the 'Calvin against the Calvinists' thesis must be understood strictly theologically. That is, scholars began to show the continuity of Reformed polity and ministry much earlier than they began to analyse the continuity of theology.

[34] P. Helm, *Calvin and the Calvinists* (Edinburgh, 1982). Helm does not hide his intentions and he acknowledges in his preface that his monograph is a rebuttal to Kendall's *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*.

to establish this sharp theological and spiritual divergence between Calvin and the Puritans, Kendall has often been driven to mangle and distort the evidence and confidently to put forward novel views for which there is little or no support."[35] Helm does not deny that there are differences between Calvin and later Reformed theologians, but he grounds these differences in historical events. He states that the Puritans had to deal with the Arminianism of Archbishop Laud and other problems that Calvin did not have to face. Therefore, with anything that extends across centuries and cultures there are natural diversions.

One of the problems surrounding this debate, though, is the word 'Puritan.' What does one mean when he says 'Puritan?' Hall, again, wades into the waters of this discussion and concludes that Puritanism is anything but homogenous and that "as soon as a statement is made a qualification of it, if not a contradiction of it, becomes necessary."[36] Ultimately, though, Hall defines Puritanism as those who took the continued modification of the Church of England more seriously than others. He writes: "For the years 1570 to 1640 surely the position is clear enough: Puritan is the regular word even though sometimes used loosely by lay opponents for those clergymen and laymen of the established, Church of England whose attitude ranged from the tolerably comformable [sic] to the downright obstreperous, and to those who sought to presbyterianise that Church from within."[37] Kendall disagrees with Hall's assessment and he chronicles some of the other Puritan definitions of his time. Horton Davies defined the Puritans as those who saw the church as "incomplete"; Sasek does not find

---

[35] Helm, *Calvin and the Calvinists*, p. 80.
[36] B. Hall, *Humanists and Protestants 1500-1900* (Edinburgh, 1990), pp. 237-8.
[37] *Ibid*., p. 251.

the term appropriate and, therefore, refuses to define it; others offer two or three definitions.[38] Kendall chooses to define these ministers and theologians as 'experimental predestinarians' and avoid the term altogether.[39] This term no doubt does the work of placing predestination as the focal point of many early seventeenth-century English Protestants, but it does little to give us a full picture of what these ministers and theologians believed and practiced.

Recently Coffey and Lim offered a much more broad understanding of the Puritans.[40] They choose to highlight three distinct attributes of the Puritan church: first, Puritanism comes from the Protestant Reformation and holds to the three main tenets of Luther's theses: *sola gratia, sola fide,* and *sola scriptura*. Second, the Puritans align themselves with the Reformed churches of Europe and not the Lutheran churches, the main characteristic of this being the stress on predestination. And finally, the Puritans originated in the Church of England and are a product of the distinct tensions that existed during their time.[41] In fact, as Patrick Collinson points out, the term 'Puritan' began as a pejorative used by some Catholics to describe a certain type of extreme Protestant.[42] Nevertheless, Puritans were those within the Elizabethan church who believed that more needed to be done; the Church of England could not stop until it returned to the example of the first-century church as revealed in the Holy Scriptures. By using this definition, we see that there is much more to the Puritan than predestination and to understand the Puritan means to analyse their whole corpus and not simply a limb.

---

[38] These three examples and many more come from Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, pp. 5-6.
[39] *Ibid*., p. 9.
[40] J. Coffey and P. C. H. Lim, "Introduction," in J. Coffey and P. C. H. Lim (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (New York, NY, 2008), pp. 1-15.
[41] *Ibid*., pp. 2-3.
[42] P. Collinson, "Antipuritanism," in J. Coffey and P. C. H. Lim (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (New York, NY, 2008), pp. 19-33.

Extending the argument past the Puritans and on to post-Reformation Reformed theologians, Richard Gamble concisely argues that theologians like Beza and Francis Turretin were in-step with Calvin's theology. He notes that these theologians were no less biblical in that they stressed the authority of the scriptures and the internal witness of the Holy Spirit.[43] Gamble also concludes that in order to understand Post-Reformation theology and its development in relation to greater Reformed history more research is needed. This need is something that this thesis intends to fill, to a degree. How Turretin fits into the Reformed Tradition is in part what my thesis will analyse. He was a successor of Calvin and Beza and he represents part of a tradition that was continuing to develop. Understanding how he relates to Calvin, Beza, Perkins and others will help fill in the gaps of scholarship concerning the post-Reformation Reformed Tradition. Carl Trueman has noted that continuing work on the Reformed Tradition is needed in order to move away from Calvin as the normative source for Reformed theology. Trueman argues that Reformed theologians looked to the confessions and not to Calvin as their authority and, therefore, modern historical analysis should be done with this proper understanding of the tradition.[44] Therefore, there are many questions concerning Turretin that need to be answered. Was he as biblical as his predecessors? Did he rely on Calvin? Or was he using a variety of sources knowing that they all impacted the development of Reformed orthodoxy? These questions, and more, will need to be answered in order to get a broad appreciation of Turretin and his impact.

---

[43] R. Gamble, "Switzerland: Triumph and Decline," in W.S. Reid (ed.), *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1982), pp. 55-71.
[44] C. Trueman, "Calvin and Calvinism," in *Companion to Calvin*, pp. 225-44.

II. The Humanism/Scholasticism Debate

Since Armstrong's work[45] in the late sixties much scholarship has focused on the method of Reformed theologians. Many of the underlying problems presented by Hall, Armstrong, and Kendall revolve around the different philosophical methods employed by Calvin and his contemporaries and theologians following Beza. This dispute deals less with the actual theology presented and instead focuses on the methodology utilized in order to define this theology. Armstrong, along with others, presents scholasticism in an unflattering light, in which Calvin's major doctrines are altered irreconcilably. James Good argued that the Reformers had a tendency towards scholasticism, but refused its use due to the "fresh religious life" that was developing during the Reformation. He continues to argue, however, that after the early 'glow' of the Reformation wore off theologies became 'hard and fast' and the Aristotelianism found in Catholicism crept its way into Calvinism.[46] In fact, Armstrong presents scholasticism as the driving force of supralapsarian soteriology. He even goes as far as to condemn supralapsarianism as unscriptural and needed in order to "satisfy the demands of logic."[47] Armstrong attributes Beza's scholasticism to the trend away from Calvin, but notes that Aristotelianism was always flourishing simultaneously with humanism. Therefore, unlike Good who sees a re-awaking of Aristotelianism after Calvin, Armstrong acknowledges Aristotelianism's continued influence.[48] Armstrong exemplifies the prevailing attitudes toward scholasticism in the mid-twentieth century: it is the cause of the break with Calvin.

---

[45] *Amyraut Heresy*.
[46] J. Good, *History of the Swiss Reformed Church Since the Reformation* (Philadelphia, PA, 1913).
[47] *Amyraut Heresy*, p. 137.
[48] *Ibid*., pp. 127-8.

One of the prevailing voices against such a view was Robert Scharlemann.[49] Scharlemann gives an excellent account of the historiography concerning scholasticism and Protestant theology. He writes that seventeenth-century scholasticism cannot be interpreted as a "relapse from the grandeur of the theology of the reformers." Rather it should be viewed as an "intellectual development" that was affected by both the internal workings of the various Protestant churches, as well as, a reflection of the Catholic polemical writings of the Counter-Reformation.[50] Without replicating his work, one can see that the research into Post-Reformation scholasticism has been both underdeveloped and overestimated. In addition to Scharlemann, Trueman and R. Scott Clark edited a series of essays reassessing Protestant scholasticism.[51] They argue that the division created by Hall and Armstrong is an 'artificial' one "between the allegedly pristine theology of, for example, John Calvin and its corruption by Theodore Beza and Reformed orthodoxy."[52] There are many essays in this volume which cover Calvin's view of scholasticism,[53] re-contextualising important Reformed documents within their historical situations,[54] and the nature of Reformed scholasticism in Great Britain.[55] As Trueman and Clark note, though, the history and history of theology regarding the

---

[49] R. Scharlemann, *Thomas Aquinas and John Gerhard* (London, 1964).
[50] *Ibid*., p. 14.
[51] C. Trueman and R. S. Clark, "Introduction," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, pp. xi-xix.
[52] *Ibid*., p. xiv.
[53] D. Steinmetz, "The Scholastic Calvin," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, pp. 16-30.
[54] R. Muller, "The Use and Abuse of a Document: Beza's *Tabula Praedestinationis*, the Bolsec Controversy, and the Origins of Reformed Orthodoxy," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, pp. 33-61.
[55] P. Schaefer, "Protestant 'Scholasticism' at Elizabethan Cambridge: William Perkins and a Reformed Theology of the Heart," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, pp. 147-64; W. R. Godfrey, "John Hales' Good-Night to John Calvin," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, pp. 165-80; C. Trueman, "A Small Step Towards Rationalism: The Impact of the Metaphysics of Tommaso Campanella on the Theology of Richard Baxter," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, pp. 181-95; and P.G. Ryken, "Scottish Reformed Scholasticism," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, pp. 196-210.

thirteenth to seventeenth centuries is in dire need of updating without the anachronistic definitions of post-Enlightenment presuppositions.[56]

In the late seventies and early eighties, however, the thesis proposed by Armstrong and Hall was heavily challenged. Possibly the most important scholar to question this interpretation is Richard Muller.[57] In *Christ and the Decree*, Muller outlines the scholarship on Post-Reformation Reformed scholasticism. Like Sharlemann, Muller chronicles the way in which eighteenth and nineteenth-century historiography has shaped twentieth-century understandings of Protestant orthodoxy. Muller writes:

> Taken as a whole, the scholarship raises the basic question of continuity and discontinuity between Reformation and post-Reformation theology, in a more restricted sense, between Calvin and the Calvinists. Writers in the nineteenth and the early twentieth century acknowledge a general continuity of doctrine accompanied by a gradual formalization of definition and realization of the systematic implication of fundamental doctrinal principles. […] More recent writers have allowed a Christological focus in the theology of Calvin but have maintained a departure from this center of doctrine in the theology of his successors.[58]

Muller's main question then became: is there a connection between the so-called predestinarian systems of the post-Reformation theologians and the Christocentric

---

[56] Some of these anachronisms are: seeing Calvin as proto-Karl Barth, the imposition of post-Kantian philosophy, and the triumph of eighteenth and nineteenth-century liberalism over orthodoxy. Trueman and Clark, "Introduction," pp. xi-xiii.

[57] Muller has done extensive work analysing Post-Reformation scholasticism. His monographs on the subject include: *PRRD*; *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition* (New York, NY, 2000); *Christ and The Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1986); *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York, NY, 2003); and *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition: On the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2012). In addition, he has written many articles and book chapters on the development of Reformed theology and scholastic Reformed methods.

[58] Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, p. 9.

theology of Calvin? In other words, have scholars properly understood the methods by which sixteenth and seventeenth-century theologians systematized their dogma?

Muller's argument continued to stress discontinuity in method, at least in terms of Calvin and his successors, while maintaining a continuity of theology. In his massive *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, Muller traces the various movements in Reformed history, dividing them into four important eras: the Era of the Reformers (1517-65), Early Reformed Orthodoxy (1565-1640), High Orthodoxy (1640-1700), and Late Orthodoxy (1700-1790).[59] The rationale for these divisions is based upon the prominent theologians writing during each era. For instance, the Era of the Reformers begins with Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575) and ends just after the death of Calvin (1564) and the final years of Pierre Viret (1511-1571). Muller limits his eras to Reformed theologians; therefore, it is not based upon the writings of Luther or Philipp Melanchthon (1497-1560). These divisions, though, are also dependent upon changes in theological method. For instance he writes concerning the 'early orthodoxy' period: "The passage of Reformed theology into the era of early orthodoxy can be charted in terms of the movement from basic, discursive instruction to a more sophisticated, dialectic model."[60] By recognizing and characterizing the various eras of Reformed orthodoxy Muller goes beyond the binary understanding of the Reformers versus the Reformed, or the humanists versus the scholastics. In fact, Muller writes, "The Protestant orthodox held fast to these Reformation insights and to the confessional norms of Protestantism and, at the same time, moved toward the establishment of an entire body of "right teaching" in continuity both with the Reformation and with the truths embodied in

[59] *PRRD*, pp. 40-52.
[60] *Ibid.,* I p. 29.

the whole tradition of Christian doctrine."[61] In essence, Muller expands the framework to include the entire history of Christian theology. He is, essentially, re-examining the Calvin versus the Calvinist thesis in a way that illuminates medieval and early Christian doctrine, not simply the developments of the sixteenth century.

In addition, Muller distinguished between scholastic methods and the content of theology. What I mean by this is that Muller concludes that the methods of theology *are* different depending upon which era of orthodoxy one is studying, but that does not entail a 'distortion' of doctrine. He writes:

> Where the Reformers painted with a broad brush, their orthodox and scholastic successors strove to fill in the details of the picture. Whereas the Reformers were intent upon distancing themselves and their theology from problematic elements in medieval thought and, at the same time, remaining catholic in the broadest sense of that term, the Protestant orthodox were intent upon establishing systematically the normative, catholic character of institutionalized Protestantism, at times through the explicit use of those elements in patristic and medieval theology not at odds with the teachings of the Reformation.[62]

A change in method does not entail a change in theology. Even more so, Muller contends that assuming that the Reformers were the beginning and end of Reformed theology is simply not to understand the Reformed Tradition. He states that it is precisely these post-Reformation Reformed theologians who codified the tradition. Without them, Muller argues, there would not be a Reformed Protestant tradition.

Concurrently with Muller, Jack Rogers' essay "The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible in the Reformed Tradition" was republished and it returned to the argument that

---

[61] *Ibid.,* I p. 14.
[62] *Ibid.,* I p. 19.

the post-Reformation scholastics "rejected the Augustinian approach of faith, especially in regard to the Bible, and reverted to the Thomistic rationalism of the Reformers' medieval opponents."[63] Rogers resurrected the early twentieth-century idea that "precision replaced piety as the goal of theology" and "reason was given priority over faith."[64] Rogers' original essay was published in 1979, seven years before the publication of Muller's *Christ and the Decree*. It is interesting to note, however, that he did not update his article when it was to be republished in McKim's anthology. Therefore, Rogers's assessment lacked contemporary scholarship that disagreed with his contention. In this case he presents a prior verdict without the benefit of competing interpretations. This oversight means that Rogers' conclusion is lacking the necessary evidence to combat Muller's variegated tradition thesis.

In response to Rogers' and McKim's book, John Woodbridge argued that they represented a 'misleading' historiography.[65] What he means is that presenting post-Reformation scholasticism as a distortion of Reformation theology is a misrepresentation, at best. Woodbridge cites many different works that were written contemporaneously or prior to Rogers and McKim and refute their claims and, yet, they do not reference these works. Ultimately, Woodbridge argues that the data presents the opposite conclusions than the ones claimed by Rogers and McKim. What Rogers and McKim have failed to do, in Woodbridge's opinion, is place the writings of the scholastics in their historical contexts. He contends that sixteenth and seventeenth-century Reformed theologians were

---

[63] J. Rogers, and D. K. McKim, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach* (San Francisco, CA, 1979), and J. Rogers, "The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible in the Reformed Tradition," in D. K. McKim (ed.), *Major Themes in the Reformed Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1992), p. 57.
[64] Rogers, "The Authority," pp. 57-8.
[65] J. Woodbridge, *Biblical Authority: A Critique of the Rogers/McKim Proposal* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1982), p. 78.

countering their Catholic counterparts and placing their writings within their original milieu informs their ultimate standing within the Reformed Tradition. He concludes:

> Because they [Rogers and McKim] desired so strongly to plead a certain case, they generally sacrificed their claims to even-handed scholarship by discounting out-of-hand contrary evidence, by neglecting a world of technical scholarship bearing on their broad subject, by fixing too uncritically upon a neoorthodox historiography, and by relying too heavily upon secondary literature rather than examining primary sources for themselves.[66]

When compared with the Muller thesis, one begins to see a burgeoning consensus in which post-Reformation Reformed theology and methods must be understood in light of their historical, and not simply theological, contexts.

The Muller/Woodbridge thesis must be the one that is preferred simply because it allows the tradition to speak for itself. Historically understanding a tradition means analysing the data and allowing conclusions to flow from it. Unfortunately, much research into the Protestant Reformed Tradition has been based on the idea that John Calvin is the *font* from which all dogma progresses. Muller's works show that this is too narrow a view. This would be similar to assuming that the Cappadocian Fathers are the origins of Christian theology and, therefore, Aquinas' scholasticism was somehow a distortion of the theology's initial intent. No scholar would claim such a thesis because it overemphasizes one source at the expense of another. One must look at the development over time and discern how one idea led to the next.[67] In Turretin's case, historians need

---

[66] *Ibid*., p. 155.

[67] Oliver Crisp takes this idea a step further, arguing, essentially, against an overarching Reformed orthodoxy. Crisp examines various "deviant" Reformed ideas in an attempt to illustrate that the Reformed Tradition is always reforming, producing various doctrines built upon the foundations of scripture,

to contextualise his writings and understand what he was refuting. To whom was he writing? Why? What were the polemics of the discussion? Can we place his writings in their wider seventeenth-century framework? Answering these questions will help us understand the Reformed Tradition as a whole and Turretin's impact, in particular.

III. The Dissemination of the Reformed Tradition

A major theme in understanding the Reformed Tradition is to understand its global context. This will also help us understand Turretin's position within the broader Reformed world. This is also an important aspect of late twentieth and early twenty-first-century scholarship in Christian history, in general.[68] These traditions expanded beyond their cultural origins and were adopted, indigenized, and adapted based upon their cultural context. Therefore, having a solid grasp on the scholarship relating to the social and cultural development of the Reformed Tradition is critical in comprehending Turretin's place in it.

The Reformed Tradition's development as a cultural force in Europe during the early-modern period sociologically has been advanced by Philip Gorski.[69] His thesis is that the Reformed Tradition gave rise to the 'bottom-up' revolution of the early modern peoples. He writes, "By refining and diffusing a panoply of disciplinary techniques and strategies,

---

tradition, and experience/doctrine: O. Crisp, *Deviant Calvinism: Broadening Reformed Theology* (Minneapolis, MN, 2014).

[68] Leading thinkers in global Christianity include Philip Jenkins and Lamin Sanneh. See Jenkins, *The Lost History of Christianity: The Thousand-Year Golden Age of the Church in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia-and How it Died* (New York, NY, 2008) and *The Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity* (New York, NY, 2002) and Sanneh, *Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture* (Maryknoll, NY, 1989) and *The Changing Face of Christianity: Africa, the West, and the World* (New York, NY, 2005).

[69] P. Gorski, *The Disciplinary Revolution: Calvinism and the Rise of the State in Early Modern Europe* (Chicago, IL, 2003).

it is argued, Calvin and his followers helped create an infrastructure of religious governance and social control that served as a model for the rest of Europe—and the world."[70] Gorski likens the social revolution of Calvinism that gave way to the early modern state as analogous to the steam engine that gave way to the industrial revolution. Gorski's thesis, then, is that the Reformed Tradition's impact upon Europe was not simply theological. In fact, he places Reformed discipline at the heart of Prussia's ascendency from "one of the most fragmented and backward monarchies of Europe" to "one of the most unified and advanced of the great powers."[71]

Like Weber before him, Gorski wants to understand the Reformed Tradition in terms of its social impact.[72] The impact of the Reformed went beyond the esoteric and often tedious theological arguments and into the life of the ordinary person. This is no doubt true as scholarship continues to probe into the way in which the Reformation differed from location to location.[73] Knudson proposes that 'Calvinism's' influence stems from its positive view of culture. He contends that Calvin, unlike other reformers whom he does not name, did not separate Christianity and culture and, therefore, God has the most important part to play in its shaping.[74]

---

[70] *Ibid*., p. xv.
[71] *Ibid*., p. xvii.
[72] M. Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York, NY, 1958). Originally published in 1934 as *Die protestantishe Ethik, und der Geist des Kapitalismus* (Tübingen, 1905).
[73] Carter Lindberg's textbook, *The European Reformations* (1st Edition, Oxford, 1996) is illustrative of this trend as it analyses the Reformation from different historical contexts and not just the German or Swiss perspective.
[74] Knudson does mention that Lutheranism, Anabaptism, Methodism, and Puritansim had a "corresponding cultural influence," but he contends, without citation, that many Christian confessions during this time took a negative or critical stance on culture while Calvinism had a positive attitude: Knudson, R., "Calvinism as a Cultural Force," in W. S. Reid (ed.), *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1982), p. 14.

What makes this even more intriguing is that the Reformed Tradition, unlike Lutheranism, was a wholly European movement. What I mean by this is that Reformed theology swept across the entire continent in a way that Lutheranism had not.[75] Though initiated in the German and French speaking parts of the Swiss Confederation, the Reformed Tradition spread rapidly throughout Europe. The question must be asked: how did it accomplish this? Why was Lutheranism confined to a, mostly, German context? Duke's answer is that Calvin was an ecumenist at heart. He did not believe that any non-biblical practice should hinder the pure preaching of the Gospel. Calvin, according to Duke, was more than willing to reach out to German Lutherans, Dutch Protestants, and his Zurich colleagues allowing many others to embrace this all-encompassing movement.[76]

Menna Prestwich chronicles many different reasons why the Reformed Tradition spread through Europe.[77] She predates Duke's thoughts and adds that the Reformed Tradition excelled at dissemination; not only in texts, but in students. She rightly points out the circulation of Calvin's *Institutes*, but also the Geneva Bible and William Ames' (1576-1633) writings to New England. In particular, the Geneva Bible had an immense impact upon Early Modern British Protestantism. Produced, in part, due to exiled British Protestants during the reign of Queen Mary, the Geneva Bible was "the most powerful of all English Bibles."[78] According to Levi, the Geneva Bible was republished over one hundred and twenty times between its first edition (1560) and the emergence of the King

---

[75] A. Duke, "Perspectives on International Calvinism," in *Calvinism in Europe*, pp. 1-20.
[76] *Ibid*., pp. 3-4.
[77] M. Prestwich, "Introduction: The Changing Face of Calvinism," in *International Calvinism*, pp. 1-14.
[78] P. Levi, *The English Bible: From Wycliffe to William Barnes* (Worthing, 1985), p. 26.

James Bible (1611).[79] But why was it so much more popular than previous English translations? Metzger gives several reasons: its quarto size made it cheap, it was printed in Roman type (instead of black letter type), and it was the first English Bible with numbered verses.[80] In addition, the Geneva Bible provided copious notes which explained difficult passages and elaborated on theological terms. Metzger claims that the scholars were ahead of their time, making some decisions that would eventually be adopted by the Revised Standard Version in the 1940s.[81] The notes were a primary way for disseminating Reformed theology. Though not overly Reformed in its first publication, subsequent editions added to the Reformed flavour of the text and the 1568-70 editions also contained Calvin's Catechism, a series of 373 questions and answers concerning faith.[82]

The Geneva Bible became *the* Bible of England in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. It was the Bible of Bunyan, Shakespeare, and King James.[83] Its initial publication in England was funded by Thomas Bodley (1545-1613), a former student in Geneva and namesake for Oxford's Bodleian Library. In fact, Metzger makes the claim that the wide publication of the Geneva Bible during this time produced a "sturdy and articulate Protestantism in Britain, a Protestantism which made a permanent impact upon Anglo-American culture."[84] His evidence is that at-home Bible reading was on the rise in England during this period and it was more likely that an Englishman would have a Geneva Bible than any other edition. Additionally, McGrath argues that being

---

[79] *Ibid*., p. 27.
[80] B. M. Metzger, *The Bible in Translation: Ancient and English Versions* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2001), pp. 65-6.
[81] B. M. Metzger, "The Geneva Bible of 1560," *Theology Today*, 17 (1960), pp. 339-52.
[82] *Ibid*., p. 348.
[83] Metzger, *The Bible*, p. 66 and Levi, *The English Bible*, p. 28.
[84] Metzger, "The Geneva Bible," p. 352.

Protestant became a point of national pride after the defeat of the Catholic Spanish Armada in 1588 and the Geneva Bible "was its sacred book."[85] Therefore, the Geneva Bible had a profound effect upon the spread of Reformed theology in England.

Geneva already had a thriving translation ethos by the time the English exiles arrived, though. In Geneva publishers revised Pierre Robert Olivetan's (1506-38) French translations of the Greek New Testament and Hebrew Old Testament in 1556 and by 1560 they had published a new version of the Vulgate and new Latin translations of the New Testament by Claude Baduel (1491-1561) and Beza.[86] Daniell chronicles the diverse Bible publications being produced in Geneva during this time and in the early modern period. Between 1560 and 1805 there were forty different French editions of the Bible, an Italian revision based on Greek and Hebrew was printed in Geneva in 1562 with subsequent revisions printed for the next hundred years, and a Spanish edition of the New Testament emerged from Geneva in 1556.[87] Geneva was, then, in the business of translating and disseminating the Bible in the vernacular. What is unknown currently is whether or not these other translations contained the copious notes and catechisms that the English Geneva Bible did. If so, one could argue that the rapid expansion of Reformed theology was due heavily to Bible translations.

In addition to the spread of the Geneva Bible, Reformed professors and students came from all over the world: John Cameron from England to France, Lambert Daneau from Ghent to Geneva, and, later, Francis Turretin to many different schools (Leiden, Paris,

---

[85] A. McGrath, *In the Beginning: The Story of the King James Bible and How it Changed a Nation, a Language, and a Culture* (New York, NY, 2001), p. 129.
[86] D. Daniell, *The Bible in English: Its History and Influence* (New Haven, CT and London, 2003), p. 292.
[87] *Ibid*., p. 293.

Saumur) before returning to Geneva.[88] Stanford Reid places much more emphasis upon the wider cultural and technological advancements of the late Middle Ages and Early Modern Europe. Reid notes the rising middle class, the expansion of war, and new ideas of the Renaissance were creating an atmosphere that would drastically change the mode of transmission in Europe.[89] Additionally, Reid cites Calvin's widespread preaching and teaching as reasons for transmission. The people wanted to hear what Calvin had to say. Reid writes:

> Calvin's hearers often wished to have copies of his sermons in print for their own reading or to give to others, but Calvin did not comply, partly because he wrote out very few of his sermons. Consequently, despite his opposition, some of this congregation employed a certain Raguenier of Bar-sur-Seine, a French refugee, who took down Calvin's sermons in a sort of shorthand.[90]

Calvin's sermons were so desired that they were eventually allowed to be copied and published for wider distribution.[91] Pettegree argues that Calvin's writings reinvigorated printing in Geneva. He charts that printing in the canton had ceased before Calvin's return, but when Calvin hit his apex as a theologian and writer (1550-64) Geneva was producing no less than 100,000 words worth of Calvin writings.[92] He concludes, then,

---

[88] Prestwich, "Introduction," in *International Calvinism*, p. 4.
[89] W. S. Reid, "The Transmission of Calvinism in the Sixteenth Century," in W.S. Reid (ed.), *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1982), pp. 33-52.
[90] Reid, "Transmission," p. 45.
[91] Reid notes that many were not published and some are still being found: *Ibid*., p. 45. In addition, Pettegree argues that Calvin was primarily known as a preacher during his time as opposed to his fame as a theologian in modern Christian history: A. Pettegree, "The Spread of Calvin's Thought", in *Companion to Calvin*, p. 208.
[92] A. Pettegree, *The Book in the Renaissance* (New Haven, CT, 2010), p. 208.

that Calvin was a "major motor" in the development of Geneva as an influential and economically viable European city.[93]

Therefore, what scholars have been able to construct is a tradition that began with the early Swiss Reformers, was rooted to Geneva through Calvin's ministry, and was promulgated through a variety of theologians, ministers, universities, and publications. A burgeoning consensus is that the Reformed Tradition's foundation was much more variegated than once believed. Though late nineteenth and twentieth-century scholarship used the term 'Calvinist' to describe this tradition, scholarship is evolving to show that this particular tradition had a variety of contributors who were responsible for its development. One simply cannot claim, any longer, that Calvin was the undisputed founder of the Reformed Tradition. Calvin was, no doubt, highly influential, but the assumption that Calvin was the unequivocal leader of the Christian Reformed Tradition is to overestimate his importance. Scholarship must continue to re-evaluate the development of the Reformed Tradition in light of this new thesis. Now that this study has established the historiography on the development of the Reformed Tradition, it becomes necessary to understand Geneva's place in Early Modern Europe in order accurately to evaluate Turretin's place in Reformed history.

IV. Early Modern Geneva and the Reformed Tradition

Geneva's geographical location placed it in perfect proximity to the turmoil in the sixteenth century. Nestled at the eastern border of present day France, Geneva was squeezed between the Lutheran German nations, the Zwinglian Swiss cantons, and the

---

[93] *Ibid*. Geneva shipped many books into Catholic France during this time, creating a "Protestant Underground" of Reformed literature: *Ibid*., pp. 208-11.

Catholic French cities.[94] Its central location made it accessible to all of Western Europe. Because of its locale, Geneva's population was extremely diverse. William Monter notes that between the years of 1501-36 new citizens came from Savoy, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Germany, and other Swiss cities.[95] Therefore, Geneva was both diverse in population and popular in terms of emigration. In a time of church reformation, Calvin and his contemporaries had to re-imagine early modern Europe in a way that suited these new developments. Therefore, in trying to understand the impact of Turretin on the Reformed Tradition one must discern the nature of Geneva from the Reformation to the seventeenth century.[96] Recognising the nature of civic and social structures will allow us to make conclusions about gaps in knowledge concerning seventeenth-century Geneva and help us evaluate Turretin's impact upon it. But first we must understand why a theologian and minister within Geneva would have had an influence to begin with.

Calvin was not immediately accepted in Geneva and he was expelled, along with Guillaume Farel (1489-1565), in 1538.[97] He was invited back in 1541, however, and Monter asserts that from 1555-59 "the history of Calvin's Church enters a triumphant phase, culminating in the foundation of the Academy in 1559."[98] Similar to the research concerning Calvin's impact upon the development of the Reformed Tradition, much

---

[94] Calvin and Geneva during Calvin's time never really had an excellent relationship with any of these other Confederations regardless of their confession (i.e. Lutheran, Catholic, or Reformed): See, W. Naphy, "Genevan Diplomacy and Foreign Policy, c. 1535-1560: Balancing on the Edge of the Confederacy," in W. Kaiser, *et al.* (eds), *Eidgenössische «Grenzfälle»: Mülhausen und Genf* (Basel, 2001), pp. 189-219.
[95] W. Monter, *Calvin's Geneva* (New York, NY, 1967), pp. 4-5.
[96] Naphy argues that Geneva's uniqueness makes it difficult to compare to other Protestant cities and he states that it is important to study the Genevan Reformation for its own sake, not simply as an "addenda to Calvin's life" or as "a mere model for other Reformations." W. Naphy, "The Renovation of the Ministry in Calvin's Geneva," in A. Pettegree (ed.), *The Reformation of the Parishes: The Ministry and the Reformation in Town and Country* (Manchester and New York, NY, 1993), pp. 113-32.
[97] Monter, *Calvin's Geneva*, p. 125.
[98] *Ibid*.

scholarship in the twentieth century has proposed the hypothesis that Calvin was a moral authoritarian, handing down harsh punishments upon anyone who swayed from his stern legalism. Robert Kingdon cites an example in which Calvin taxed the people of Geneva for being a "perverse and unhappy nation, and, although there have been good men, the nation is perverse and wicked."[99] When one analyses the situation in Geneva during Calvin's time a different picture emerges.

In Kingdon's "Social Welfare in Calvin's Geneva" he convincingly shows that much of the social structures pertaining to the city were executed without Calvin's immediate supervision.[100] Primarily, Kingdon cites the example of the *General Hospital* in Geneva whose establishment came before Calvin's time. In fact, Kingdon attributes the general ethos of the Reformation to the development of this social welfare institution. He writes:

> I think, in fact, that there may be some truth in the reverse proposition: that when it came to deciding how the Christian community should institutionalize its obligation to help the poor, it was not Calvin who influenced Geneva, but rather Geneva that influenced Calvin.[101]

Kingdon proposes that Calvin's influence upon social welfare was much more indirect; making certain social roles ecclesiastical in nature. Kingdon does delineate between the General Hospital and the Consistory, however, and does claim that Calvin played an extensive role in the Consistory of Geneva, often having a hand in the election of the Consistory's members. The Consistory was one of the many committees in Geneva

---

[99] R. Kingdon, *Geneva and the Consolidation of the French Protestant Movement 1564-1572* (Geneva, 1967), p. 13.
[100] R. Kingdon, "Social Welfare in Calvin's Geneva," *American Historical Review*, 76 (1971), pp. 50-69.
[101] *Ibid*., pp. 60-1.

tasked with governing the city; its particular task was to maintain the moral climate of the canton.[102]

In addition, Kingdon asserts that the Reformed Tradition pushed for "rationalization and laicization."[103] Rationalization dealt with the reorganization of social structures into a single unified body and laicization dealt with removing clergy from these institutions and appointing businessmen, doctors, and other non-clerical persons in their place. The general governance of the city was conducted by a small body of 25 and a larger body of 200.[104] These bodies were elected, though. As said before, these elections were often well-organized by the elites of the city and the council of 25 was made up entirely of native-born Genevan *bourgeoisie*.[105] These men were not elites in the sense of having extravagant wealth or nobility; rather, they were elite due to their citizenship. One could purchase the right of *bourgeoisie* with a small fee or was given the title for free, like Calvin, making him eligible to be elected to the small or large council.[106] What Kingdon and Monter propose, therefore, is a Geneva government that was quite separate from Calvin's rule in a direct sense.

Monter instead describes Geneva as a 'theocracy', not in the sense that the pastors had direct control over the governance of the city, but rather that the rule of God was a

---

[102] R. Kingdon, "Calvin and the Family: The Work of the Consistory in Geneva," in R. Gamble (ed.), *Articles on Calvin and Calvinism 3: Calvin's Work in Geneva* (New York, NY, and London, 1992), pp. 93-106. The consistory was incredibly pervasive in Geneva during Calvin's time. Kingdon argues that five to seven percent of the adult population of Geneva was summoned each year before the Consistory. Therefore, it is easy to assume, in a city with a population of only 13,000, that everyone was affected, either directly or indirectly, by the rulings of the Consistory: see R. Kingdon (ed.), *Registers of the Consistory of Geneva in the Time of Calvin*, (1 vol., Grand Rapids, MI, 2000), I pp. xvii-xxxv. This volume is essential as it is a translation of the Consistory registers from 1542-44.
[103] Kingdon, "Social Welfare," and "Calvinism and Social Welfare," *Calvin Theological Journal*, 17 (1982), pp. 212-30.
[104] Monter, *Calvin's Geneva*, pp. 144-6.
[105] *Ibid*., p. 146. Monter argues that this contributed to hostility between the magistrates and the company of pastors as most of the pastors were immigrants from France.
[106] *Ibid*., pp. 146-7 and W. Naphy, "Calvin's Geneva," in *Companion to Calvin*, pp. 25-37.

presupposed mentality of the citizenship. Parker writes, "Because the Reformers reject the legal system of Rome, the so-called ecclesiastical constitutions, it must not be thought that they deny authority to the Church. The power of the Church, rightly defined, is the ministry of God's Word."[107] Gamble writes that for Calvin doctrine and life go "hand in hand;" there is no separation between the sacred and secular.[108] They may be separate in practice, but they are united under the Holy rule of God. The church did, however, retain the right of excommunication. Gamble states that this was different for Calvin as Zurich did not believe that the church had the power to excommunicate.[109] The power of excommunication was important due to Geneva's stress on social discipline. Because Geneva had become the city for refugees, Calvin and his pastoral contemporaries believed it was of utmost importance that Genevan civil discipline was preserved. If not, the city could be plunged into revolution or revolt.[110] Even worse an undisciplined society could lapse back into Catholicism or heresy.

The question then becomes, "how much control did the church have over the community?" If the Consistory was controlled by the Venerable Company of pastors then Calvin, Farel, and others would have retained a high degree of control. If there was, on the other hand, practical autonomy between civic and religious institutions then the ministers' influence would have been minimal. It appears, however, that the case is somewhere in-between; Calvin carried significant political and ecclesial influence enabling him to sway the magistrates towards his conclusions.

---

[107] Parker, *John Calvin,* p. 59.
[108] Gamble, "Switzerland," p. 58.
[109] *Ibid*.
[110] See Naphy, "Calvin's Geneva," p. 32.

Benedict offers some examples of this influence; I will examine two in order to illustrate Calvin's, and the general pastorate's, leverage over the magistrates.[111] The first is the example of Jerome Bolsec. In 1551 Bolsec criticized Calvin's views on predestination at Geneva's weekly Bible conferences. Calvin reacted so strongly that he convinced the government to take Bolsec into custody for blasphemy. Bolsec appealed to the other major Reformed cities—Basel, Zurich, and Bern—and to Calvin's dismay they responded that both were speaking "immoderately" in regards to this doctrine.[112] In the end, the magistrates banished Bolsec for "having risen too audaciously in the holy congregation of our ministers and having proposed a false opinion contrary to the sacred scriptures."[113] By the time the controversy was over the magistrates had declared Calvin's *Institutes* to be "God's Holy doctrine" which effectively silenced dissent.[114]

The second is the notorious story of Michael Servetus. Servetus was a heterodox doctor who had a penchant for publishing his works regardless of the danger they attracted. After corresponding with Calvin about his non-Trinitarian views, Servetus published the *Restitution of Christianity* anonymously. He was tracked down, however, thrown into prison, and then escaped. His hubris got the best of him and while he was fleeing Lyon he stopped in Geneva and listened to one of Calvin's sermons. Someone in the congregation recognized him and he was immediately arrested. The other Reformed cities expressed their disgust at Servetus' claims and he was burned at the stake.[115] This did not sit well with the Genevans, however, as Benedict asserts that many of the other

---

[111] Both examples come from Benedict, *Christ's Churches*, pp. 103-6.
[112] *Ibid*., p. 104.
[113] *Ibid*.
[114] *Ibid*., p. 105.
[115] *Ibid*., pp. 105-6.

refugees in the city found Calvin's justification of capital punishment as a threat to their well-being and some responses emerged, most especially Sebastian Castellio's refutation of Calvin's justification.[116]

This is important for two reasons: first, is that it shows the degree to which piety controlled the public. If one was found to be in violation of the works of the Reformers, especially Calvin, one was in danger of severe punishment. Second, is the degree in which the other Reformed cities were involved. There appears to have developed a tripartite rule for punishment: recognition by the ministers as having drifted outside the bounds of orthodox Protestantism; the opinions of the leaders of the Swiss cantons; and the final verdict as laid down by the civic magistrates. While not all co-equal—as Calvin certainly had more sway than the Bernese leaders—there appears to be some small indication of cooperation between the ministers and magistrates.

The Consistory did not deal with theological issues solely, but often worked as an education and counselling mechanism.[117] Kingdon shows that often the Consistory was called upon to educate the newly Protestant city about its fresh theology. They required Genevans to recite the Lord's Prayer in French, not Latin, and to pray in a non-Catholic fashion (i.e. the Hail Mary and prayers to the saints were prohibited). By doing this the Consistory was purging the Geneva population of its Catholic past. In addition, the Consistory often settled familial disputes. This ranged from family quarrels to conflicts with neighbours to adultery. The Consistory existed as an instrument to enforce piety upon the people and promote the knowledge of orthodox Protestant theology.[118]

---

[116] This, in turn, caused Theodore Beza to respond with *Of the Punishing of Heretics by the Civil Magistrate* (1554): *Ibid*., p. 106.
[117] R. Kingdon, "The Geneva Consistory in the Time of Calvin," in *Calvinism in Europe*, pp. 21-34.
[118] *Ibid*., p. 22.

The final and possibly most important aspect of Early Modern Geneva was the influence of the Geneva Academy. Francis Turretin eventually assumed the title of Chair of Theology at the Geneva Academy, a position his father and Theodore Beza had before him. It is exceedingly important, therefore, to comprehend the Academy's impact in the Reformed Tradition and how that changed during Turretin's tenure. The opening ceremony of the Academy was on July 5, 1559 with an oration given by the founding rector Theodore Beza.[119] The importance of Calvin's Academy cannot be understated because of its impact upon training future pastors and theologians throughout Europe.[120] Gillian Lewis notes that only thirteen of the original class of one hundred sixty were from the Swiss confederation, and only three from Geneva itself. She writes that many went on to be pastors in Italy, Germany, and France, and some like Thomas Bodley, founder of Oxford's Bodleian Library, also studied at the Academy.[121] This wide-reaching body of students is why both Monter and Gamble refer to the Academy as "the most famous center of Protestant learning in Europe."[122]

The Academy may also give us an indication of the spread of the Reformed Tradition over Lutheranism and Anabaptism. Benedict argues that within the first five years of the Academy it enrolled three times more students than the Academy at Zurich.[123] Ronald Wallace asserts that even Beza's appointment as founding rector was done due, in part, to

---

[119] G. Lewis, "The Geneva Academy," in *Calvinism in Europe*, pp. 35-63.
[120] Though the Academy was started by Calvin, it should be noted that positive changes in education in Geneva and France started before Calvin's time and even before Protestantism: W. Naphy, "The Reformation and the Evolution of Geneva's Schools", in B. Kümin (ed.), *Reformations Old and New: Essays on the Socio-Economic Impact of Religious Change c. 1470-1630* (Aldershot, 1996), pp. 185-202.
[121] Lewis, "The Geneva Academy," pp. 49-50.
[122] Gamble, "Switzerland," p. 66 and Monter, *Calvin's Geneva*, p. 212.
[123] Benedict, *Christ's Churches*, p. 113.

Beza's international reputation.[124] Therefore, the Academy was prepared to be an international leader in the Reformed world.

Stanford Reid argues that Calvin was able to control the teachers of the Academy through "strict ecclesiastical discipline, insisting that they should be appointed by the ministers, should subscribe to the Confession of Faith in Geneva, and should be at all times subject to the ecclesiastical authorities."[125] Reid's argument brings up an important question in the development of the Reformed Tradition: how much of an influence did the confessions of the Reformation and post-Reformation period have upon the Reformed church? This question is mainly a theological one, as confessions and creeds often dealt with the policing of 'correct' theology. Nevertheless, confessions often impacted the everyday life of the early modern European because if one did not profess worship as delineated by a certain confession then one could be in danger of excommunication or worse.

Due to the proliferation of different theological perspectives after the Reformation, many ecclesiastical bodies issued a confession of faith. But what is a confession? For Jaroslav Pelikan creeds and confessions are difficult to define. They are, in his estimation, easier to describe than precisely articulate. He writes that much like the term "church," a confession or creed can only be truly defined after years of examination and reflection upon it. Still, Pelikan offers what he calls a "working definition."[126] "Creed, Confession of Faith: In theological usage this term does not primarily mean the act of

---

[124] R. Wallace, *Calvin, Geneva, and the Reformation: A Study of Calvin as Social Reformer, Churchman, Pastor and Theologian* (Edinburgh, 1988), p. 100.
[125] W. S. Reid, "Calvin and the Founding of the Academy of Geneva," in R. Gamble (ed.), *Articles of Calvin and Calvinism 3: Calvin's Work in Geneva* (New York, NY, and London, 1992), p. 247.
[126] J. Pelikan, *Credo: Historical and Theological Guide to the Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition* (New Haven, CT, and London, 2003), pp. 2-3.

confessing the faith but a series of propositions in which the magisterium and Tradition have sought to provide a more or less complete formulation of the content of faith. This is also called a profession of faith or *symbolum*."[127] Pelikan does not stop at this single definition, though. He continues:

> Confessions of Faith: Verbal confessions of faith can take on multiple forms, but there is one form that is privileged in certain formularies, called 'symbols of faith' or 'credo'…which present the three 'articles of faith' concerning, respectively, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The creed is an exposition, in few but precise words, of that doctrine which all Christians are bound to believe.[128]

Pelikan's definition, therefore, gives a nuanced and thorough understanding of what a confession or creed is. It serves two purposes: it informs the church of its belief and it allows the tradition's adherents verbally to assent to said belief.[129]

Confessions and creeds are not unique to the Reformed or even Protestant traditions. In fact, Pelikan identifies the Jewish *Shema* as the "primal creed."[130] "Behind and beneath all the primitive creeds of the apostolic and sub-apostolic era there stands the primal creed and confession of the Christian Church, *The Shema*: 'Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord.'"[131] In the history of the Christian church, however, primacy must be given to the creeds of the early church. As Pelikan notes, these creeds, developed in the first eight centuries of the Common Era, are deemed binding on all

---

[127] *Ibid*., p. 3.
[128] *Ibid*.
[129] The Presbyterian Church in the USA (PCUSA) writes, "When Christians make a confession, they say, 'This is what we most assuredly believe, regardless of what others may believe and regardless of the opposition, rejection, or persecution that may come to us for taking this stand.'" Found in Presbyterian Church (USA), "The Confessional Nature of the Church," in D. K. McKim (ed.), *Major Themes in the Reformed Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1992), p. 19.
[130] Pelikan, *Credo*, p. 374.
[131] *Ibid*.

mainstream traditions of the Christian faith; this includes the Reformers. However, Luther's protest against the use of indulgences in the Catholic Church produced a plethora of divergent theological interpretations. Therefore, it became essential that the various emerging traditions codify their definitions into unique versions of Christian 'orthodoxy.'

For the Reformed Tradition, this emerged through many different confessions, though, again, each was reinforced by the 'three creeds': the Nicene Creed, Athanasius' Creed, and the Apostle's Creed.[132] According to Pelikan, these three statements were the only ones the Reformers would have been referring to; therefore, when they referenced a 'creed' it was one of these three.[133] The term 'confession,' for Protestants, came to define a specific document as it pertains to a certain denomination. From 1535-81 there were no less than eight separate Reformed confessions (the [First] Bohemian Confession [1535], The First Helvetic Confession [1536], The French Confession [1559], The [first] Scots Confession [1560], The Belgic Confession [1561], the Second Helvetic Confession [1566], the [second] Bohemian Confession [1575], and the [second] Scots Confession [1581]) and Pelikan argues that due to the proliferation of Confessions during this time it "was impossible, even in the nineteenth century, to find a copy of the *Westminster Confession of Faith* in Protestant and Reformed Germany, and the very existence of that confession was largely unknown."[134] There were so many confessions being produced in so many different areas of Europe a confession that is famous by contemporary standards, such as the Westminster Confession, was largely unknown in Germany. Pelikan even

---

[132] *Ibid*., p. 457.
[133] *Ibid*.
[134] *Ibid*., p. 466.

refers to this time as the "era of confessionalisation" in the Western church. Even the Catholic Church had to 're-confessionalize' through the convening of the Council of Trent from 1545-63.[135] Noll notes that confessions were meant to be "uncomplicated yet authoritative statements of the new faith" and "brief theological summaries that all could understand."[136]

Schilling, before Pelikan, analysed this period even further identifying four phases of confessionalization between 1555 and 1700. First was the beginning of confessionalization from the 1540s to 60s. Schilling notes that this was not the beginning of confessionalization per se, as the Lutherans and Catholics had begun to confessionalize in the early years of the Reformation, but he argues that the Reformed church could not "territorialise" until the 1540s when there was a "renewed outbreak of the antagonisms that were previously only latent in Germany."[137] The second phase was the "transition to confessional confrontation" in the 1570s. He cites the St Bartholomew's day massacre in France, in which French Huguenots were assassinated in Paris and other provinces, as the major event that caused Protestant churches to tighten their ranks against Catholicism and each other.[138] The third phase, "the apogee of confessionalization," from the 1580s to 1620s was the rise of the Reformed churches as a

---

[135] *Ibid*., pp. 466-7.
[136] M. Noll, *Confessions and Catechisms of the Reformation* (Leicester, 1991), p. 14.
[137] H. Schilling, "Confessionalization in the Empire: Religious and Societal Change in Germany Between 1555 and 1620," in *Idem.* (ed.)*, Religion, Political Culture and the Emergence of Early Modern Society: Essays in German and Dutch History*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, 50 (New York, NY, 1992), pp. 205-45 and *Idem*, "The Second Reformation—Problems and Issues," in *idem, Religion, Political Culture and the Emergence of Early Modern Society: Essays in German and Dutch History*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, 50 (New York, NY, 1992), pp. 247-301. For a wide variety of articles concerning confessionalization see, J.M. Headley, *et al*. (eds), *Confessionalization in Europe, 1550-1700: Essays in Honor and Memory of Bodo Nischan* (Aldershot, 2004).
[138] Schilling, "Confessionalization," pp. 222-6 and Schilling, "Second Reformation," pp. 264-6.

distinct body.[139] Finally, the fourth phase was confessionalization without war. Schilling argues that during this period, between the 1620s and early eighteenth-century, confessionalization developed due to irenic principles and then slowly declined as confessionalization, and religion in general, as a political polemic was abandoned or completed.[140]

Schilling argues, though, that confessionalization was an important part of state-building in the early modern period. He writes: "Based on their respective confessions of faith, the three great (four, including Anglicanism)[141] developed into internally coherent and externally exclusive communities distinct in institutions, membership, and belief."[142] Schilling goes on to argue that continued confessionalization in Europe led to three distinct outcomes: 1) ecclesial bureaucracy expanded (i.e. consistories, superintendents, parsons, etc.), 2) state activities broadened through the exercise of these bureaucracies into areas that were previously the domain of the Medieval church (i.e. schools, marriage, family life, etc.), and 3) the state ruler's position became one of 'defender of the faith.'[143] Hsia adds "For the Brandenburg electors and their Calvinist ministers, Calvinism was not merely a personal faith, but the outward expression of God's work in the perfection of the state."[144] Pettegree pushes back against this thesis, especially as it pertains to North

---

[139] Schilling, "Confessionalization," pp. 226-30 and Schilling, "Second Reformation," pp. 266-9.
[140] Schilling, "Confessionalization," pp. 230-2 and Schilling, "Second Reformation," pp. 269-71.
[141] The three he is referring to are Lutheranism, Reformed, and post-Trent Roman Catholicism.
[142] H. Schilling, "Confessional Europe," in T. Bradley, *et al.* (eds), *Handbook of European History 1400-1600* (New York, NY, 1995), p. 641. This argument is continued in W. Reinhard, "Pressures Towards Confessionalization? Prolegomena to a Theory of the Confessional Age," in C. S. Dixon (ed.), *The German Reformation* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 172-92.
[143] H. Schilling, "The Reformation and the Rise of the Early Modern State," in J. Tracy (ed.), *Luther and the Modern State in Germany*, Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, VII (Ann Arbor, MI, 1986), pp. 25-6. See also, W. Reinhard, "Reformation, Counter-Reformation, and the Early Modern State: A Reassessment," *Catholic Historical Review,* 75 (1989), pp. 383-404.
[144] R. P. Hsia, *Social Discipline in the Reformation: Central Europe 1550-1750* (London, 1989), p. 58.

Western Europe. He argues that many developing nation-states during this period were forced to tolerate multiple confessional bodies while maintaining a state-church. He uses the Netherlands as an example, in which William of Orange purposefully kept his Reformed allies from taking control. Pettegree acknowledges that toleration was never an 'official' stance in the Netherlands, yet it was unofficially recognized.[145] Pettegree's premise is limited to North Western Europe, but it still shows that confessionalization was important in the Early Modern period as a way of identifying "social, political, and cultural change."[146] In addition to Pettegree, Lotz-Heumann argues that modern historiography is moving away from the idea that confessionalization and state-building are interlinked. Instead, he contends that the concept of confessionalization can be used to help historians understand cross-discipline comparison during the early modern period. He writes: "By integrating the discussion of political, social, and cultural developments in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, this concept enables us to see, for example, possible connections among the different spheres."[147]

For the Reformed, it became a matter of utmost importance to confessionalise. McKim argues, "The history of the Reformed Tradition is filled with confessions of faith by Reformed Christians written at different times and places. As Reformed Christians, we believe that confessing our faith is one of the most important things we can do."[148] Returning to the Academy of Geneva, we begin to see the need for strict adherence to a

---

[145] A. Pettegree, "Confessionalization in North Western Europe," in J. Bahlcke and A. Strohmeyer (eds), *Konfessionalisierung in Ostmitteleuropa: Wirkungen des religiosen Wandels im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert in Staat, Gesellschaft und Kultur* (Stuttgart, 1999), p. 111.
[146] Schilling, "Confessionalization," p. 210.
[147] U. Lotz-Heumann, "Confessionalization," in D. Whitford (ed.), *Reformation and Early Modern Europe: A Guide to Research* (Kirksville, MO, 2008), p. 150.
[148] D. K. McKim, *Introducing the Reformed Faith: Biblical Revelation, Christian Tradition, Contemporary Significance* (Louisville, KY, 2001), p. 2.

certain brand of Christianity. Calvin's insistence upon an agreed confession materialised in the *Second Helvetic Confession* written in 1566, two years after his death. According to Kálmán Tóth, "The Helvetic Consensus served as common ground, uniting various centers of the Reformation—in Switzerland, in the Palatinate, and in Lower Germany—in a covenant in their constitutional struggle to secure freedom of Religion."[149] Though it was not written by Calvin, it nevertheless allowed the Swiss cantons and Geneva to unite regarding the principles of the Christian faith over and against their Lutheran counterparts.[150] Benedict goes on to regard the *Second Helvetic Confession* to be "the most authoritative statement of these areas of agreement and thus of the essential theology of the Reformed Tradition at the end of the second generation."[151]

Socially, Benedict argues that as Western Christendom continued to confessionalize, rulers of territories began to promote Church worship and piety as a means of expanding influence and adherence. Because of this, many areas continued to produce more detailed and complicated confessions, often scrutinizing over minute details of the faith. In essence, this brings us back to the Academy and Turretin. In 1646 the *Westminster Confession* was published; in 1675 Turretin, along with other Swiss Reformed ministers, charged Johann Henry Heidegger to write the *Helvetic Consensus Formula*. This *Consensus* was highly significant and many historians refer to it as the "epitome of Reformed scholastic theology."[152] However, it is also immensely controversial, as Klauber points out: "opponents in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries used

---

[149] K. Tóth, "The Helvetic Reformation in Hungary," in W.S. Reid (ed.), *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1982), pp. 139-69.
[150] Benedict, *Christ's Churches*, p. 57.
[151] *Ibid*., p. 118.
[152] M. Klauber, "The Helvetic Formula Consensus (1675): An Introduction and Translation," *Trinity Journal*, 11 (1990), pp. 103-23.

[scholasticism] as a pejorative term to designate an outmoded form of theology."[153] Therefore, much scholarship on the subject has been clouded by confessional and methodological presuppositions, not allowing the substance to speak for itself. There have been some improvements in the last twenty years, though, as the above detailing of Muller's variegated thesis shows. What is needed, then, is in-depth research concerning the *Consensus* and Turretin's role in its writing. If confessionalization is an important part of Early Modern Christianity in general and the Reformed Tradition in particular, then it is imperative that historians understand the *Consensus's* place in the history of the Reformed church.

V. Scholarship on Turretin

So far this research has sought to understand the various scholarly debates concerning the theological, ecclesial, and societal context in which Turretin was born. Now, however, we must turn to scholarship concerning Turretin himself in order to pinpoint gaps in the literature.

Since Turretin's death in 1687 very little has been written about him, especially in relation to the amount written about Calvin, Beza, Luther, and other first and second generation Protestants. There have been, however, some monographs and articles relating to Turretin's life and theology, but nothing of a substantial nature in quite some time. James T. Dennison's brief biography of Turretin remains the only twentieth or twenty-first-century detailing of Turretin's life.[154] While Dennison's biography is a good summary of previously published secondary sources, it is a scant twelve pages long and

[153] *Ibid*., p. 103.
[154] J. Dennison, "The Life and Career of Francis Turretin," in *Elenctic Theology*, pp. 636-48.

does not offer any new archival or primary document research. Two previous biographies about Turretin were published in the late nineteenth century. The first was published in 1871, titled *Vie de Francois Turrettini,*[155] and the second is *Francois Turrettini: Sa Vie et Ses Oeuvres et le Consensus*.[156] With a nearly one hundred year gap between Keizer's book and Dennison's article, there proves to be a dire need for an updated biography concerning Turretin, utilizing new sources, the fruits of archival research, and also placing Turretin into revisionist interpretive frameworks.

Currently there are very few surviving works regarding seventeenth-century Geneva. Two important monographs remain, however. The first is J. A. Gautier's *Histoire de Geneve*; the second: Jean Senebier's *Histoire litteraire de Geneve*.[157] Both works offer a short look into the life and impact of Turretin. In these books Gautier and Senebier present Turretin in a positive light and they share many similarities. One is that they compare Turretin to his father, Benedict (1588-1631), and they find him equal or greater in stature. Benedict was also a professor of theology in Geneva and he was a key component in the adoption of the Canons of Dort.[158] He was, therefore, a predecessor to Francis in terms of vocation and theology. Another is that they quickly detail his work in securing funds for the city. Both Benedict and Francis were called upon by the city of Geneva to appeal to the Dutch Reformed cities to help rebuild and fortify the city of Geneva against any outside forces, most notably the Duke of Savoy. Benedict secured funds in 1622 and Francis obtained seventy-five thousand Livres in 1661.[159] Senebier

---

[155] *Vie Turretini*.
[156] G. Keizer, *Francois Turrettini: Sa Vie et Ses Oeuvres et le Consensus* (Lausanne, 1900).
[157] *Histoire Genève*, and J. Senebier, *Histoire litteraire de Geneve* (3 vols, Geneva, 1786).
[158] J. Beeke, "The Order of the Divine Decrees at the Genevan Academy: From Bezan Supralapsarianism to Turretinian Infralapsarianism," in J. Roney and M. Klauber (eds), *The Identity of Geneva: The Christian Commonwealth, 1564-1864* (London, 1998), p. 64.
[159] *Histoire Geneve*, I p. 518 (footnote).

and Gautier declare that Turretin's work in Holland and West-Friesland to be so successful that these confederations requested Turretin to stay and take on the ministry. Gautier writes, "Pendant le sejour que Mr. Turrettin fit en Hollande, il precha a diverses fois d'une maniere si edifiante, et avec un applaudisement si universel, que l'eglise Wallonne de Leide, et ensuite l'eglise Francoise de la Haye, le solliciterent vivement de leur accorder son Ministere, mais il refusa constamment l'une et l'autre vocation, par la raison qu'etant attache au service de l'Eglise et l'academie de Geneve"[160] It appears, then, that eighteenth-century writers saw Turretin in a positive light, choosing to highlight his successful financial endeavours on behalf of the city, while leaving out Turretin's theological arguments. The natural question, then, is why? What was the purpose in leaving these details out? Did they simply not know about the inner workings of Reformed theologians during this time or did they deliberately omit these details for other reasons? In order to understand Turretin's immediate impact and legacy it will be necessary to analyse this further.

What is most curious about both documents, however, is that they omit the writing and codification of the *Helvetic Consensus Formula*. Gautier's work is a general history of Geneva and, therefore, he may have decided that a specific theological work did not merit mention. The *Helvetic Consensus* was also not a Geneva specific document. The Swiss cities of Geneva, Bern, and Basel drafted this theological consensus and it may have been simply too broad for a Geneva history. Senebier's choice to exclude the *Consensus* is a little more troubling, though, as his methodology is more bibliographic. That is, Senebier's work lists important Genevan authors and includes a bibliography of

[160] *Ibid*.

their works; he does not include the *Consensus* under Turretin's published works. It is true that Heidegger wrote the *Consensus*, but scholars place Turretin in the midst of its development. This could indicate that the *Consensus* did not impact Genevan society and culture. This document may have been limited to the Academy and had little effect on the greater Genevan community. It was only in effect for thirty years in Geneva and only eleven in Basel. Therefore, its impact may have been too minimal. However, it may simply be that since Turretin did not write the final draft he is not considered its author. More historical research will be needed in order to understand fully its omission.

Senebier's analysis of Turretin, however, is telling of his influence in the wider Protestant community. In Senebier's appraisal of Turretin's *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* he writes, "On admire dans ce livre la charite de l'Auteur; pour la premiere fois, peut-etre, on vit un Theoloigien qui ne disputoit pas, qui etoit sans partie et qui cherchoit uniquement la verite pour la."[161] This is a departure from much twentieth-century historiography that portrayed scholasticism, and Turretin, as highly polemical. In this instance, Senebier is presenting Turretin as a writer who offered charity and desired only to know the truth. Therefore, eighteenth-century historians agreed that Turretin was a man of high intellect, repute, and charity. But this is, of course, only one side of the coin and Senebier is perhaps naïve about the polemical nature of Reformed theology in general and Turretin in particular. In order to understand Turretin's reputation in Geneva, Switzerland, and early modern Europe we will need to adopt new lines of inquiry. This is one gap my thesis will fill.

[161] Senebier, *Histoire litteraire de Geneve*, II p. 245.

While historiography on Turretin is minuscule and out-of-date, scholarship pertaining to Turretin's theology, both historically and constructively, has begun to emerge. Throughout the twentieth century there has been a myriad of dissertations concerning Turretin's theology. Beginning in 1956 with John Beardslee's unpublished Yale dissertation,[162] many graduate students have done their doctoral work trying to understand how Turretin's theology, exemplified by his *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, fit into the Reformed Tradition.[163] One of the most recent lines of inquiry is into Turretin's use of 'covenant theology.' J. Mark Beach's doctoral thesis exemplifies this idea. Beach argues that Turretin's use of federal theology was neither unique nor ground-breaking, but it was used to defend the doctrine of grace as "the hallmark" and the "centerpiece of God's grace is Christ."[164] In essence, what Beach is trying to prove is that there is an inherent unity in the Reformed Tradition that many have either overlooked or not properly understood. Therefore, Beach's thesis presents an attempt to show the clear connection between the Reformers and the various Reformed theologians

---

[162] J. Beardslee, "Theological Development at Geneva Under Francis Turretin and Jean-Alphonse Turretin (1648-1737)," Yale University Ph.D. thesis (1956).

[163] Theses include: D. Grohman, "The Genevan Reactions to the Saumur Doctrine of Hypothetical Universalism," Knox College Ph.D. thesis (1970); P. Jensen, "Calvin and Turrettini: A Comparison of their Soteriologies," University of Virginia Ph.D. thesis (1988); T. Phillips, "Francis Turretin's Idea of Theology and Its Bearing Upon His Doctrine of Scripture," Vanderbilt University Ph.D. thesis (1986); S. Spencer, "Reformed Scholasticism in Medieval Perspective: Thomas Aquinas and Francois Turrettini on the Incarnation," Michigan State University Ph.D. thesis (1988); B. Inman, "God Covenanted in Christ: the Unifying Role of Theology Proper in the Systematic Theology of Francis Turretin," Westminster Theological Seminary Ph.D. thesis (2004); and J. E. Bruce, "Divine Choice and Natural Law: the Eudokian Ethics of Francis Turretin," Baylor University Ph.D. thesis (2008).

[164] J. Beach, "Christ and the Covenant: Francis Turretin's Federal Theology as a Defense of the Doctrine of Grace," Calvin College Ph.D. thesis (2005), p. 398. This thesis joins other works on the nature of Federalism and the Reformed Tradition including: S. Strehle, *Calvinism, Federalism, and Scholasticism: A Study of the Reformed Doctrine of Covenant* (New York, NY, 1988) and P. J. Wallace, "The Doctrine of the Covenant in the Elenctic Theology of Francis Turretin," *Mid-America Journal of Theology*, 13 (2002), pp. 143-79.

of the post-Reformation era; it is a rejoinder to Muller's variegated, but unified, thesis detailed above.[165]

In addition to the cited unpublished theses, are the articles of Sebastian Rehnman.[166] Rehnman's work seeks to understand Turretin's use of philosophical concepts. Rehnman does a good job helping the reader comprehend Turretin's use of philosophical definitions, but he does not give, nor was it his intention to give, any indication as to what Turretin's historical situation or impact was. Therefore, Rehnman's articles provide a good secondary source for understanding Turretin's use of philosophy, but not his importance to the Reformed Tradition. Additionally, van Asselt, *et al*. examined Turretin's *locus* on free will from a theological/philosophical perspective.[167] This essay, though a strong analysis of Turretin's nuanced views of Free Will, provides very little historical detail beyond what is provided in the nineteenth-century sources. This work joins a series of other monographs devoted to analysing and comparing Turretin's theology to other theologians within the Reformed Tradition or to the greater Christian Church. Often, these monographs home in on specific *loci* within Turretin's *Institutes* rather than on their historical context.[168]

---

[165] See Ch. 1, pp. 29-31 (n. 57). This is also not surprising as Muller was his doctoral supervisor.
[166] S. Rehnman, "Alleged Rationalism: Francis Turretin on Reason" *Calvin Theological Journal*, 37 (2002), pp. 167-86 and *Idem*, "Theistic Metaphysics and Biblical Exegesis: Francis Turretin on the Concept of God," *Religious Studies*, 38 (2002), pp. 167-86.
[167] W. J. van Asselt, *et al*., "Beyond Indifference: An Elenctic Locus on Free Choice by Francesco Turrettini (1623-1687)," in W. J. van Asselt, *et al*. (eds), *Reformed Thought on Freedom: The Concept of Free Choice in the Early Modern Reformed Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2010), pp. 171-200. This essay also provides a new translation of *quaestio* 1-3 in Turretin's *locus* X, Free Choice of Man in the State of Sin.
[168] Some examples of this are: S. Spencer, "Francis Turretin's Concept of the Covenant of Nature," in W. F. Graham (ed.), *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives* (Kirksville, MO, 1994), pp. 71-91; S. J. Grabill, *Rediscovering the Natural Law in Reformed Theological Ethics* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2006), pp. 151-74; *Idem*, "Natural Law and the Noetic Effects of Sin: the Faculty of Reason in Francis Turretin's Theological Anthropology," *Westminster Theological Journal*, 67 (2005), pp. 261-79; O. Crisp, *Retrieving Doctrine: Explorations in Reformed Theology* (Milton Keynes, 2010), pp. 69-91; J. V. Fesko, *Beyond Calvin: Union with Christ and Justification in Early Modern Reformed Theology (1517-1700)* (Göttingen,

In terms of the above detailed scholarship concerning the Reformed Tradition's methodology, one can easily place Turretin within the scholastic camp. Richard Muller's aforementioned *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* analyses Turretin's use of scholastic methods with some detail, though Muller does not focus primarily on Turretin and instead chronicles the wider trends in post-Reformation Reformed theology. Other scholars such as Martin Klauber have done extensive research into the nature of Turretin's theology.[169] Was Turretin a loyal Reformed theologian (i.e. Calvinist) or was he a loyal scholastic like the Medieval theologians before him? This question continues to be analysed as more primary documents become available through archival research, digitalisation, and translation. This thesis, however, intends to address the historical situation of Turretin's writings in relation to theological method. By better understanding Turretin historically, one will be able to place his theological method on more solid ground.

But what else do we know, historically, about Turretin? Did he have a following? Was he known in other parts of Europe during his life? Did he leave a legacy after his death? These are all important questions that need to be examined before we can understand where the gaps in knowledge are and how this thesis will proceed. The primary importance of these questions is that they help us understand what his immediate

---

2012), pp. 318-39; J. E. Bruce, *Rights in the Law: The Importance of God's Free Choices in the thought of Francis Turretin* (Göttingen, 2013); and P. Tachin, "The Logic of Monergism and Synergism in Francis Turretin's Soteriology," *Kerux: The Journal of Northwest Theological Seminary*, 28 (2013), pp. 33-47.

[169] See M. Klauber, "Reason, Revelation, and Cartesianism: Louis Tronchin and Enlightened Orthodoxy in Late Seventeenth Century Geneva," *Church History*, 59 (1990), pp. 326-39, *Idem*, "Reformed Scholasticism in Transition: Benedict Pictet and Enlightened Orthodoxy at the Academy of Geneva," in W. F. Graham (ed.), *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives* (Kirkville, MO, 1994), pp. 93-118, and *Idem*, "Francis Turretin on Biblical Accommodation: Loyal Calvinist or Reformed Scholastic?," *Westminster Theological Journal*, 55 (1993), pp. 73-86. See also the section on Turretin in H. van den Belt, *The Authority of Scripture in Reformed Theology: Truth and Trust* (Leiden, 2008), pp. 153-63.

impact was. Did his contemporaries respect his life and work or was his impact limited to eighteenth and nineteenth-century readers? Answering these questions will help us determine his impact holistically in terms of immediate and future impact.

In terms of his following, we can ascertain that he was at least known in quite a few areas of Europe. Obviously, he was fairly well known in Geneva itself. Francis' grandfather came to Geneva in the late sixteenth century and his son, grandson, and great-grandson would become theological leaders in their adopted home. Francis' father, Benedict, preceded his son in the professorship of theology at the Academy of Geneva and, like Francis, he secured funds from the Netherlands in defence of Geneva. Therefore, the Turretin family established itself as an ardent defender of the faith and of the city in a short period of time. When the time came to secure funds for the rebuilding of the Genevan walls a generation later, Francis was called upon to retrace his father's footsteps and succeeded in the same way, according to Senebier and Gautier.[170] As detailed above, Turretin was known in the eighteenth century in Geneva at least for his monetary success, if not also for his theological prowess.

In addition, one of the most important primary documents concerning Turretin's life is his funeral oration presented by his nephew Benedict Pictet (1655-1724).[171] Pictet portrays Turretin as "the blessed one" whose only goal was that the "talents entrusted to him should be used for the public."[172] Though written with an intended interpretation, Pictet's *Oration* gives the scholar an in-depth and immediate account of the life and

---

[170] Senebier, *Histoire Litteraire de Geneve* and Guatier, *Histoire de Geneve*.
[171] According to Keizer this was first published in the third Genevan edition of the *Institutes* in 1696. Keizer, *Francois*, p. 223.
[172] B. Pictet, "Funeral Oration of Benedict Pictet Concerning the Life and Death of Francis Turretin: Delivered on the Third Day of November of the Year 1687," in *Elenctic Theology*, III p. 665.

impact of Turretin. Even more important, as with Guatier and Senebier, is what Pictet leaves out. Dennison has presented Turretin's tenure at Geneva as the beginning of a "Protestant civil war."[173] Though Dennison does not lay the blame at Turretin's feet, he does rightly acknowledge that due to the theology of Amyraut in Saumer there was theological infighting in the Academy. Pictet does not mention any of this turmoil and he even praises one of Turretin's theological adversaries, Philippe Mestrezat (1618-90), therefore, preserving Turretin's peaceful legacy. The history of the Academy in the seventeenth century is somewhat less polished than Pictet would like to admit.

In the nineteenth century, Jean Pierre Gaberel published, *Histoire de L'Eglise de Geneve depuis le Commencement de la Reformation jusqu'a nos jours*. In it he recounts some of the conversations between Turretin and his colleagues Louis Tronchin (1629-1705) and Philippe Mestrazat. Dennison reports that the Academy was visibly split between "'universalists' (Tronchin and Mestrezat) and 'anti-universalists' (Turretin)."[174] Pictet's funeral oration does not mention this, however. The simplest answer (and what may be the correct one) is that Pictet was simply not dragging up feuds during the re-telling of his uncle's life at his funeral. But Pictet mentions Tronchin in a positive light during his *Oration* presenting, therefore, a more complicated view of what was going on at the Academy during Turretin's tenure. What we know for sure, however, is that there was a theological argument being had over the hypothetical universalism of Moses Amyraut and the growing Arminian theology.

Since his death there have been a few additional publications of his *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* and these publications give us some indication of his broadening

---

[173] Dennison, "The Life and Career," III p. 643.
[174] *Ibid*., III p. 646.

influence. Immediately following his death the *Institutes* were republished in Geneva in 1687-89[175]; a few years later they were published again in Leyden and Utrecht (1696), with a short introduction by the new printers and Pictet's Funeral Oration added.[176] Therefore, it appears in the immediate aftermath of his death his writings were still popular enough to continue to be published. The next publication, as far as I am aware, does not come until the nineteenth-century, but this time the *Institutes* are published in Edinburgh in 1847-8.[177] This indicates that his readership had extended widely enough, and was popular enough to be published in Scotland. This may demonstrate that there are more publications in existence in other parts of Europe and/or America. Further to this argument are a pair of sermons that were published in 1678 and 1696 in Dutch.[178] Turretin primarily wrote in Latin with a few works in French;[179] therefore, the need for a sermon in Dutch would signify that he was either popular in the Dutch speaking lands during his lifetime or that his writings were popular enough to warrant translation after his death. This line of inquiry, if followed, may unearth other publications during or after his lifetime that demonstrate his popularity in Europe.

Another important aspect of Turretin's posthumous reputation is his use in the United States. Turretin's works became popular with the Princeton theologian Charles Hodge (1797-1878). Dennison argues that over three thousand ministerial candidates in the Presbyterian Church during the nineteenth century were instructed using Turretin's

---

[175] F. Turretinus, *Institutio theologiae elencticae* (3 vols, Geneva, 1687-89).
[176] F. Turretinus, *Turrettini Theologiae* (4 vols, Leyden, Utrecht, 1696).
[177] F. Turretinus, *Francisci Turrettini Opera* (4 vols, Edinburgh, 1847-8).
[178] F. Turrettini, *Predicatien over verscheide texten der H. Schriftuur gedaan door Francois Turrettin* (Utrecht, 1678) and F. Turrettini, *Vier uytgeleesene predicatien over verscheydene texten der H. Schriftuur, wegens den staat van Godts Kerke* (Amsterdam, 1696).
[179] F. Turrettini, *Sermons sur divers passages de l'Ecriture Sainte* (Geneva, 1676) and *Idem*, *Recueil de sermons sur divers texts de l'Ecriture Sainte* (Geneva, 1686).

Insitutes.[180] The *Institutes* was the *de facto* textbook of Princeton Theological Seminary from Hodge's time until he wrote his own systematic theology in 1872-3.[181] What is unknown now, though, is what edition of Turretin's *Institutes* he used. In 1847-8 there was an edition published in New York and it is highly possible that Hodge used this version as his guide.[182] In addition, we know of at least one other publication of a topic in the *Institutes* which was published as *Turretin on the Atonement of Christ*.[183] It is unknown, however, whether Hodge used these publications and/or another. The most important aspect of Hodge's use of Turretin is the impact that Turretin's theology may have had on the development of Protestantism in the United States. Since my thesis proposes to understand Turretin's impact upon the Protestant Reformed Tradition, understanding Hodge's use and adaptation of Turretin's theology will be invaluable for my final conclusions.

Finally, the most recent full publication of the *Institutes* was in 1997 with the Dennison edition. This is the whole work in three volumes entirely in English. Dennison's edition also provides a translation of Benedict Pictet's *Funeral Oration*, also in English. In addition, there have been a few publications of single topics from the *Institutes*.[184] Therefore, in the last thirty years there has been a desire for Turretin's published works, at least on the academic level. It will be important to understand

---

[180] Dennison, "The Life and Career," III p. 645.
[181] C. Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (3 vols, New York, NY, London, and Edinburgh, 1872-3).
[182] F. Turrettino, *Francisci Turrettini Opera* (4 vols, New York, NY, 1847-8).
[183] J. Willson (ed.), *Turretin on the Atonement of Christ* (New York, NY, 1859).
[184] These include: R. Winburn (ed.), *Francis Turretin's Seventh Disputation: Whether it can be Proved the Pope of Rome is the Antichrist* (trans. K. Bubb, Forestville, CA, 1999); J. Beardslee (ed.), *The Doctrine of Scripture* (trans. J. Beardslee, Grand Rapids, MI, 1981), and *Idem*, *Reformed Dogmatics, Seventeenth Century Reformed Theology: The Writings of Wollebius, Voetius, and Turretin* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1977).

Turretin's current popularity in order to assess comprehensively his impact upon the Reformed Tradition.

In terms of the broad aspects of Turretin's life we know a fair amount. Turretin was born in Geneva to Benedict and Louise Micheli Turrettini in 1623. He was the middle of seven children and he showed promise from a young age. His family moved to Geneva in the late sixteenth century after his grandfather, Francesco, was converted to Protestantism by the preaching of Peter Martyr Vermigli in Italy. Francesco feared for his life after the Inquisition was sent to his hometown of Lucca and, therefore, had to flee.[185] The Turrettini family, then, had become fully Protestant since the time of Francis' grandfather. Francis was educated throughout Europe, spending some time studying in Geneva, Leiden, Utrecht, Paris, Saumur, Montauban, and Nîmes. During this time, he learned from a variety of scholars including Pierre Gassendi, a Roman Catholic scholar in Paris, and Moses Amyraut at Saumur. Therefore, Turretin was exposed to a wide variety of theological ideas during his time as a student. In 1649 Turretin took up the call as the minister to the Italian church in Geneva, thus beginning his journey as a preacher of the word.[186]

Turretin's time in Geneva as minister and theologian was marked with theological disputation. In 1634 Amyraut published his *Brief traitte de la predestination et de ses principals dependances* which detailed his views on 'hypothetical universalism.' In 1653 Turretin took on the chair of theology at the Geneva Academy setting himself up to be the leader in Reformed Orthodoxy in contrast to Amyraut, Arminianism, Anabaptism, and Roman Catholicism. In addition, Turretin had to deal with the various heterodox and

[185] Dennison, "The Life and Career," III p. 640.
[186] *Ibid*., III p. 643.

Enlightenment theologies that were continuing to spread throughout Europe. Beardslee argues that Western Europe in the seventeenth century had, essentially, accepted plurality as best evidenced by the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 in which all civil parties accepted the tenets of the 1555 Peace of Augsburg, especially *cuius regio, eius religio*, "whose realm, his religion."[187] Baruch Spinoza had already established himself in Amsterdam, and the works of Arminius were well known throughout much of the Western world. Therefore, Turretin was called upon to defend his tradition over and against other traditions that were trying to stake their claim on the European landscape. Again, we can see that Turretin's historical situation is known in its broad context. What is not known, however, is how these circumstances affected him, Geneva, and the Reformed Tradition in an in-depth manner. How did Amyraut's theology affect the delicate Church/State balance in Geneva? Did it require Turretin, the Venerable Company, or Consistory to tighten its hold or was the city on its way towards secularization?

Turretin's children carried on the family name and his son, Jean-Alphonse, eventually became the chair of theology following his father and grandfather. J.A. Turretin was very different than his father, though. Francis had been one of the architects of the *Helvetic Formula Consensus*; his son was one of its primary demolishers. Klauber argues that by J.A. Turretin's time the *Consensus* had become a "divisive and outdated" confession that was a hindrance to faith for many in Enlightenment Europe.[188] The younger Turretin's disapproval of the *Consensus* led to its annulment in Geneva in 1705; only eighteen years after Francis' death. It can be assumed, then, that J.A. was not a

---

[187] Beardslee, *Reformed Dogmatics*, p. 3.
[188] M. Klauber, "Jean-Alphonse Turretini and the Abrogation of the Formula Consensus in Geneva," *Westminster Theological* Journal, 53 (1991), pp. 325-38.

proper follower of his father; in many ways that honour fell to Benedict Pictet, J.A.'s cousin and Francis' nephew.

It would seem, then, that Turretin did not have a strong following after his death. This chapter has argued, to a degree, though, that much of Turretin's following can be seen in Scotland and the United States in the eighteenth and nineteenth century through the republication of the *Institutes*. In addition, the Princeton theology of the nineteenth century invokes Turretin frequently. Mark Noll writes, "In his *Systematic Theology*, for example, Hodge regularly interweaves testimony from Calvin, the Second Helvetic Confession of 1566, the English Westminster Confession and Catechism of the mid-seventeenth century, and the works of late seventeenth-century polemicist Francis Turretin to support his own Reformed conclusions."[189] Therefore, there is a case to be made for a strong posthumous influence on the Reformed Tradition. However, this thesis will need adequately to present primary and secondary sources from Turretin's death to nineteenth century America in order to understand comprehensively his importance.

I have detailed, therefore, what we know about Turretin in a broad sense. We have an indication of the metanarratives of Turretin's life, placement of his theology in relation to his methodology (i.e. scholastic or humanist), and a preliminary outline of the known major publications of his work. However, one will easily notice that much of what is known is on a surface level; very little is known about the inner workings of his life and ministry in Geneva and immediate and prolonged influence of his writings. Therefore, this review will now turn to the bulk of what my thesis will cover and why it makes a difference to Early Modern Religious history and theology.

---

[189] M. Noll, *The Princeton Theology 1812-1921: Scripture, Science, and Theological Method from Archibald Alexander to Benjamin Warfield* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2001), p. 28.

VI. Methodology

In order to accomplish this research, it will be necessary to do extensive archival research. The Archives in Geneva remain an important resource for the study of the Reformation and post-Reformation eras. There are documents pertaining to the Consistory, the Venerable Company of Pastors, and personal letters written by Turretin himself. Some of the letters housed at the Bibliothèque de Genève include: letters written by Turretin to a student in Montpellier, letters to Louis Tronchin, his embattled co-worker, and a letter to the Bishop of Lucca. All of these manuscripts are housed at the Bibliothèque de Genève and the Archives d'Etat de Genève. In order properly to understand Turretin's historical context and his wider impact during his life, it will be important for me to analyse these documents (and many others not mentioned).

In addition to the above evidence it will be important to understand the wider breadth of Turretin's theological works. As detailed above, many theologians and philosophers have analysed Turretin's *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*; however, there are quite a few theological discourses that have not been analysed. As one can see in the bibliography, much of Turretin's work has not been translated from Latin or French and there are two sermons in Dutch that have yet to be scrutinized, as well. Therefore, it will be just as important to situate his theology as a whole and how it relates to the Reformed Tradition's heritage and succession.

This thesis, then, will cover both Turretin's historical and theological legacy and how his work impacted the Reformed Tradition. As this literature review has shown, though, research on Turretin's historical context is underdeveloped and in need of drastic updating. Therefore, this thesis will primarily be historical in nature: dissecting primary

documents in order to place Turretin's life in context. There will be, however, some chapters that deal with Turretin's writings using theological methodology. More specifically, the theological analysis will ultimately centre on Turretin's works in relation to the Reformed Tradition overall, making it more of an exploration of historical theology than strict constructive theology.

VII. Research Question

Ultimately this research will centre on this question: what was the impact of Francis Turretin (1623-87) on the Protestant Reformed Tradition? Analysing the secondary literature concerning Turretin and explaining the methodological framework has also brought to light another question: "how will this research impact the historiography of early modern Christianity?" I will attempt to answer this question while simultaneously defining my overall research goals.

First, secondary literature research has shown that Turretin is an underdeveloped figure in historical research who had a significant impact upon his tradition. This is important because of the debate over the origins of the Reformed Tradition. The older view argued that post-Reformation theologians deviated from the intended theology of Calvin causing a distortion in the evolution of the Reformed Tradition. Understanding Turretin's history and theology in its context and in relation to the broader themes of the Reformed Tradition will help scholars interpret the nature of the Tradition as a whole. Was Calvin the ultimate authority in the Reformed Tradition? Did Turretin appeal to Calvin or some other authority as his guide? Did other theologians and ministers who identified with the Reformed Tradition support Turretin in his theological pursuits? Did

those who came after Turretin recognize him as an important part of the Tradition? And finally, how did later Reformed theologians use Turretin's work in the construction of their unique theologies? These questions are important because they broaden the scope of the history of the Tradition. Turretin played a part in the moulding of the Reformed Tradition in the seventeenth century; understanding his impact will uncover new facts about the Reformed Tradition holistically.

In addition, Turretin represents a time after Calvin, but before the Enlightenment in which the divisive aftermath of the Reformation can be felt both theologically and politically. Denominations are proliferating, nations are taking sides, and new ideas are emerging. How did Turretin react to these events? Did they shape or change his theology over time? Calvin updated his *Institutes* multiple times over the course of his life as he grew in knowledge, reacted to theological disputes, and anticipated future conflicts. Turretin may have had the same experience. How did he react to heterodox theologies? Did he attempt to maintain moral and theological parity in Geneva? Were there non-Reformed theologians working in Geneva? If so, how did Turretin react to their influence? Within thirty years of his death, Geneva had begun to move away from 'high orthodoxy' and towards a more tolerationist atmosphere; how did Turretin have to deal with this during his tenure? Since he was the chair of theology at the Academy of Geneva he would have had considerable influence over the Academy's academic trajectory. How did he deal with these situations and how did his choices affect the overall situation in Geneva? All of these questions are informed by the continued emergence of the modern European state in which political and social power is being consolidated in various sovereign rulers each with their own unique identity. How then

did Turretin attempt to control or preserve the Reformed religious and political ethos of Geneva, if at all?

Finally, Geneva was an important city in Western Europe and Turretin was an integral part of the city's early modern context. How, then, did Turretin impact his wider European situation? We know that there was a publication of his *Institutes* in the nineteenth century in Edinburgh indicating that his influence had spread into the English speaking world. How soon did this happen? Did he ever go to England? How many students from Britain did he teach, if any? Is there ecclesial or theological evidence of his impact in Great Britain during the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries? What about France? Geneva was a French speaking city and many French refugees fled to Geneva after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes; how did this affect the dissemination of Turretin's ideas and works? In short, what was Turretin's impact during his lifetime and shortly after in the greater European context?

Therefore, one can see that there is much to be explored. Because the historiography of early modern Christianity is moving away from the study of the founders of traditions and towards the holistic analysis of said traditions,[190] it is becoming more and more critical to understand the nature of a tradition as it develops in its context. This means that research on Turretin and his impact is coming at a pivotal time in the development of scholarship. I believe that my research has the possibility to reshape our understanding of post-Reformation Reformed history and theology in a way that is more nuanced, comprehensive, and contextual than previous academic works.

---

[190] A. Burnett, "Contributors to the Reformed Tradition," in D. Whitford (ed.), *Reformation and Early Modern Europe: A Guide to Research* (Kirksville, MO, 2008), pp. 25-56.

Chapter 2: The State of Geneva during the Seventeenth Century

The city of Geneva's importance to the Reformed Tradition and the propagation of 'evangelical' Christianity must be defined in order to understand Turretin's ultimate impact upon that Tradition. William Naphy makes the compelling case that modern historiography concerning the Reformed Tradition must broaden to include the history of the city of Geneva.[191] Developing Robert Kingdon's thesis concerning Geneva, Naphy writes, "Kingdon began this change by returning to the sources, in this case, the manuscript materials in the Genevan State Archives. By showing, as he did, how much detail was available there and how much more detailed an understanding of the Reformation could arise from using these sources, Kingdon highlighted the need to make these sources more available."[192] Naphy and Kingdon were stressing the need to move away from interpreting the Reformation *solely* through the eyes of 'great men' like Calvin and Beza. Instead, they, and others, have shown that Geneva deserves a place in the history of the Reformation in its own right, regardless of the famous names that preached and printed within its walls. For many within the Reformed Tradition, Geneva was considered the 'mother church' and, whether positively or negatively, this city had a profound effect upon its neighbouring sister cities.[193] The canton of Geneva and the

---

[191] W. Naphy, "Developments in the History of Geneva Since the 1960s," in S. Barker (ed.), *Revisiting Geneva: Robert Kingdon and the Coming of the French Wars of Religion* (St Andrews, 2012), pp. 85-98.
[192] *Ibid*., p. 85.
[193] McNutt's monograph concerning eighteenth-century Geneva does a good job outlining the historiography regarding Early Modern Geneva. In her second chapter, McNutt illustrates how intrinsic Geneva's presence was to the Reformed world in terms of ministers, worship, and symbolically, as in Geneva's reputation as *la Rome protestante*: J. P. McNutt, *Calvin Meets Voltaire: The Clergy of Geneva in the Age of Enlightenment, 1685-1798* (Farnham, 2013), pp. 25-67.

Reformed Tradition cannot be separated; they are inextricably linked in their development. It is, therefore, vital to understand the context and influence of seventeenth-century Geneva in order to analyse accurately Turretin's impact upon the Reformed Tradition. It is impossible to examine exhaustively every aspect of Genevan life and culture. This chapter will instead consider those aspects which are most relevant to Francis, namely Geneva's importance in seventeenth-century Europe, the state of the Churches of Geneva, the governing bodies of the canton (mainly the Consistory and the Small Council), and finally the Geneva Academy.

I. Geneva in Seventeenth-Century Europe

Situated along the border of modern day France, Geneva has had a long history as a major actor on the world stage.[194] In the late fourteenth century, though, Geneva was mostly under the jurisdiction of the Duke of Savoy. The Savoyard state stretched from northern Italy and, essentially, surrounded Geneva on all sides. The external rule of the Savoyard family had negative consequences on the city. For many years prior to Savoyard rule, Geneva had been a bustling economic hub situated in the middle of Medieval Europe. "Long governed by its bishop, [Geneva] had by 1500 largely fallen under the sway of the dukes of Savoy, who possessed rights of legal jurisdiction over the city and had turned the episcopal see into a virtual family monopoly."[195] In the early sixteenth century, however, the Genevan authorities began divesting themselves of influential families who were sympathetic towards Savoyard rule. Ultimately, through

[194] This continues today as Geneva has played a major part in the development of universal human rights, it is the home to the World Council of Churches, and is a world-wide financial and banking centre.
[195] P. Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism* (New Haven, CT, 2002), p. 78.

creative diplomacy and "executions and banishments," Geneva was able to sign a treaty with Bern in Switzerland and Freiburg in Germany to provide military protection and establish their own civil authority.[196] The Savoyards were never keen to let Geneva go and much of Genevan history during the seventeenth century centred on keeping the Savoyard force at bay.

As stated in the previous chapter, Geneva was already in the midst of ecclesiastical reform before Calvin arrived. It was not a peaceful transition, however. Calvin's contemporary, Guillaume Farel (1489-1565), was having difficulty persuading the city to abandon Roman Catholicism in favour of evangelicalism. In fact, Benedict notes that Farel was almost killed after being arrested and questioned by the city's officials while a mob gathered chanting "Kill, kill this Lhuter [sic]."[197] Soon, though, evangelicalism began to take hold within the canton and after Calvin's removal (1538) and reinstatement (1541) in the city, evangelicalism finally won out.

Geneva's influence upon France in the seventeenth century cannot be understated. The Reformed movement spread throughout France with incredible speed and determination. In fact, Philip Connor contends that "There is no question that Geneva played a crucial role in directing the shape of this evangelical fervour, not least through its ministers and the resources at its disposal, print and propaganda."[198] But there is a debate centred on the degree to which Geneva dictated the growth of the Reformed churches in France and Europe in general. What place did indigenized cultures play in

---

[196] *Ibid*., p. 79.
[197] *Ibid*., p. 80.
[198] P. Connor, "Geneva in the Centre? The Challenge of Local Church Orders," in S. Barker (ed.), *Revisiting Geneva: Robert Kingdon and the Coming of the French Wars of Religion* (St Andrews, 2012), p. 23.

adopting and adapting the evangelical movement in their own contexts? There is some evidence that suggests that Geneva's influence waned in the years after Calvin.

Connor records the example of a local church in Le Mans, France, founded in 1561 which often circumvented the developing rituals and definitions of Reformed polity. Connor gives three examples from the Registers of the Consistory of Le Mans: first, deacons had much more power in Le Mans than Calvin envisioned. For the Reformed in Geneva deacons were called to shepherd specific duties such as caring for the "poor and sick." In Le Mans their duties were expanded to include governance in the church and administration of the liturgy.[199] In addition, unlike Geneva, the noble elite were given some unique power and used it to persuade parishioners to give more monetarily to the church, something Connor credits for the vitality of the church in Le Mans during a time of ecclesial uncertainty.[200] Finally, the church in Le Mans emphasized 'congregationalism.' Congregationalism stressed the autonomy of each local church, promoting the idea that each congregation should govern itself. Connor argues that this was in competition with the preferred structure of Presbyterianism and the authority of national synods.[201] It is difficult to tell whether Le Mans is an isolated case within the larger Reformed community in France, though. Connor claims that it is one of hundreds of Reformed churches founded during this period, but it is still not definitive in generalizing about Geneva's influence over Reformed practice.

Again Connor gives us some indication of the prevailing Reformed influence in France. He argues that for much of southern France the city of Montauban served as

---

[199] *Ibid*., pp. 26-7. Connor cites the Registers found in M. Anjubault and H. Chardon (eds), *Recueil des pieces inédits pour servir à l'histoire de la Réforme et de la Ligue dans le Maine* (Le Mans, 1867).
[200] Connor, "Geneva in the Centre," p. 26.
[201] *Ibid*., pp. 27-8.

'mother church.' Montauban and its surrounding parishes were heavily influenced by Pierre Viret (1511-71) and many churches sprang up in the wake of his ministry. This caused there to be a great need for rural ministers to shepherd the new Protestant converts. Montauban soon became the source and support for many of these new churches, often times sending ministers and dealing with moral discipline. Connor admits, though, that the conversion of the French countryside was difficult for various reasons; war, Catholic ubiquity and clerical shortages being among the reasons. Yet he argues persuasively that the Reformed Tradition's impact on southern France was not dependent upon the charity of Geneva. "From the beginnings of the Reformation ministers emerged from the ranks of the town's population: former lawyers, teachers, doctors, merchants and notaries dominated the pastoral corps."[202] Geneva's influence was still widely felt, though, mostly due to its expansive book trade; southern France was simply never able to duplicate the powerful printing culture of Geneva and other European towns.[203] In addition, Montauban at least felt the need to keep Geneva informed on developments within the Reformed synods of France. One Genevan-appointed minister was represented at a regional synod in Montauban and a copy of the minutes of the synod was sent to the Company of Pastors in Geneva.[204] Therefore, Geneva was still considered an important ally in France regardless of its immediate influence upon the region.

---

[202] P. Connor, *Huguenot Heartland: Montauban and Southern French Calvinism During the Wars of Religion* (Aldershot, 2002), p. 40.
[203] There are many other similarities between Montauban and Geneva that Connor highlights including the development of a Protestant academy, the swift conversion of the citizens within the city to Reformed Protestantism, and the chosen form of government, with the political and ecclesial bodies being separate: *Ibid*., pp. 210-15.
[204] R. Kingdon, *Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion in France, 1555-1563*, Cahiers d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 82 (Geneva, 2007), pp. 86-7 and Connor, *Huguenot*, p. 210.

By the end of the sixteenth century, however, Geneva's print influence in France was beginning to wane. Geneva's presses dominated the printing market in France for a majority of the mid 1500s; in 1559, however, France's output drastically expanded. The most dramatic example is 1562 when Geneva only published around thirty of the over three hundred Protestant books.[205] Pettegree gives two reasons for this surge: first, France in the 1560s finally became a formidable entity in its own right in the Reformed Tradition. Geneva simply could not keep up with the demand. Second, the French churches were somewhat dissatisfied with Geneva's conservative culture. The leaders of Geneva were "unwilling to supply, or even to permit Geneva publishing houses to print" certain books that addressed the cultural and political climate of France.[206] France's growth began to decline, though, after the first of the French Wars of Religion ceased in 1563 and Geneva's prominence began to expand to its pre-1562 levels.[207] However, it is clear that the French Reformed had the infrastructure and market for evangelical books printed in France when the political climate was conducive. As the Wars of Religion in France continued to escalate, though, printing shifted to eastern France and back to Geneva.[208]

In greater France there is ample evidence that Geneva continued to play an important part in the spread of the evangelical faith, albeit not an exhaustive one. Kingdon notes

---

[205] Andrew Pettegree has published an informative graph showing the undulation of published works in the Protestant community in general and Geneva in particular: see A. Pettegree, "Genevan Print and the Coming of the Wars of Religion," in S. Barker (ed.), *Revisiting Geneva: Robert Kingdon and the Coming of the French Wars of Religion* (St Andrews, 2012), pp. 62-4.

[206] Many of these works were political in nature, intended to provoke the Huguenot leaders, but they also included Calvin's *Institutes*. Interestingly, one publisher in Caen counterfeited Geneva's publishing mark no doubt attempting to benefit from Geneva's fame: Pettegree, "Genevan Print," pp. 66-7.

[207] Geneva's output during this time remained mostly unchanged, but France's oscillated greatly from around 250 books in 1562 to less than 50 in 1571: *Ibid*., p. 64.

[208] *Ibid*., p. 69.

that much of the work of the Company of Pastors in Geneva was missionary in essence. His extensive work with the Registers of the Company of Pastors in the *Archives d'Etat* in Geneva indicates the importance the Company placed upon missionary activity in France. They were highly selective, though. The Company did not find it a good use of resources to send a *proposant* to a city or region that did not adhere to its definition of Reformed Orthodoxy.[209] In addition, it was quite common for various churches to request a 'loan' minister, someone whom they only desired to have temporarily. This practice continued throughout the seventeenth century and it will come up again as we discuss Francis's tenure as a minister in Geneva. In some instances these short-term appointments would become permanent or the city would continue requesting the minister until the Company in Geneva eventually denied any further extensions.[210] In the minutes of the Venerable Company from the early seventeenth century, the French cities of Boffres, Bourg, Crest, Dijon, Grenoble, Neuchâtel, and Nîmes requested ministers from Geneva and various letters to and from France, including a letter from the Company of Pastors to the Synod in Montpellier in 1611, are recorded.[211] By the 1650s, however, the number of requests in France dropped dramatically. The Venerable Company only records one instance of a French church requesting a minister, when the church in Lyon requested the services of Francis Turretin.[212] The French Reformed church by the time of Francis's tenure in Geneva was producing its own ministers through its various academies throughout the nation. Within France, therefore, Geneva retained a degree of

---

[209] Kingdon, *Geneva and the Wars of Religion*, pp. 31-40.
[210] This, as we shall see, is the case with Turretin and the city of Lyon.
[211] AEG, RCP 5, ff. 5, 28, 45, 46, 47, 77, 89, 214, 316, 328, 348, 397, 416. The letter to Montpellier was sent as an encouragement to the Synod and a note that Montpellier had recommended three students to the Academy at Geneva.
[212] AEG, RCP 10, f. 6 (23 January 1652).

influence throughout the sixteenth century leading into the seventeenth. By Turretin's time, however, France had certainly come into its own as a source of Reformed theology and evangelism. In the next chapter, I will continue to show Geneva's impact upon the wider Reformed Tradition both through the publishing community and the influence of Geneva born or trained ministers.

Prestwich also notes Calvin's personal influence in France. Calvin wrote extensively to the nobles in the court of the King of France, Francis I, on behalf of the Huguenots. Though his appeal was a failure, Prestwich writes that he succeeded in "giving cohesion to the churches in France" and that "the structure of the consistory with elders and deacons was made obligatory, and trustworthy ministers were made available on request by the Company of Pastors in Geneva."[213] Calvin's influence in France was extensive, warning the churches there not to administer the sacraments without a functioning consistory in place as a congregation in Nîmes was doing.[214] By the end of the 1650s, the Company of Pastors in Geneva was still functioning as an influence upon France. At the Synod of Loudun in 1659 the Venerable Company sent a series of articles concerning the Synod to the syndics. Among other concerns, the Venerable Company made sure to criticise Louis Cappel (1585-1658), the French Hebrew Professor at Saumur, who denied the inspiration of the Hebrew vowel points.[215] The Pastors were attempting to persuade the syndics of the Synod to side with their position on the polemical issue. Again, though, this adds to the arguments made by Prestwich and Connor that Calvin and Geneva's overall influence has, at times, been overemphasised. The Venerable Company

---

[213] M. Prestwich, "Calvinism in France, 1555-1629," in *International Calvinism*, p. 84.
[214] *Ibid*., p. 84.
[215] AEG, RCP 11, ff. 92-3. The controversy concerning the Academy of Saumur and the Hebrew vowel points will be discussed in the following chapter.

sent the letter, but ultimately the Synod sided with Cappel and the theologians of Saumur. The Pastors tried to convince the French synod, but they decided against the Company in Geneva and forged their own path forward.[216] The development of the Reformed Tradition in France must be understood, then, as a contribution of both the leaders of Geneva and France to the growth of evangelicalism in France.

What about Geneva's influence upon, and relationship with, the other states of Early Modern Europe? Is there any evidence of Genevan influence in Germany, the Netherlands, or England? As stated in the opening chapter,[217] Geneva's influence upon the wider Reformed Tradition can be traced back to its openness towards religious and political dissidents from around Europe. One of the most difficult aspects of charting Geneva's influence upon other Early Modern states is the relative independence of the various Reformations during the sixteenth century. For instance, the Reformation in England is seen as an independent movement of reform with its own precursors, instigators and political and religious motivations.[218] Collinson writes, "English church

---

[216] Mentzer's work on Reformed identity in France is an important one and highlights the difficulty of the French Reformed to divorce the traditions of Catholic France from right Reformed ecclesiology. One such problem that he highlights is intermarriage between Evangelicals and Catholics: R. A. Mentzer, "Fashioning Reformed Identity in Early Modern France," in J. M. Headley, *et al*. (eds), *Confesionalization in Europe, 1555-1700: Essays in Honor and Memory of Bodo Nischan* (Aldershot, 2004), pp. 243-55.

[217] Ch. 1, pp. 40-55.

[218] Hornbeck's recent monograph on Lollardy sums up the difficulty of defining the pre-Reformation reform movements in England: "The uncritical use of a single label to encompass the whole range of late medieval dissenters, their texts, and their beliefs thus entails a host of methodological problems. Insufficiently qualified, the use of a blanket term like 'Lollardy' for all inhabitants of the religious margins of late medieval England seems to imply the existence of an organized, centrally governed group of dissenters." This also highlights the uniqueness of the English Reformation: there were serious reform movement in progress well before Luther, Zwingli or Calvin came to the forefront: see J. P. Hornbeck, *What is a Lollard? Dissent and Belief in Late Medieval England* (Oxford, 2010), p. 7. In addition, there is a debate concerning the influence of Lutheranism in early Reformation Scotland, though it is generally agreed that Lutheranism failed by the mid-1540s: see M. Taylor, "The Conflicting Doctrines of the Scottish Reformation," in D. McRoberts (ed.), *Essays on the Scottish Reformation 1513-1625* (Glasgow, 1962), pp. 245-8, J. Kirk, "The Influence of Calvinism on the Scottish Reformation," *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, 18 (1974), p. 157, and M. Lynch, "Calvinism in Scotland, 1559-1638," in *International Calvinism*, pp. 225-6.

settlement rested primarily on the principles of autonomy from Rome and royal supremacy, not on the reception of true doctrine and conformity with the community of Reformed churches."[219] Early Modern Europe, however, was not made up of a series of vacuous political states, but rather a relatively interdependent group of nations united, for most of the medieval period, around the Roman Catholic Church. When the Reformations swept through Europe many people were displaced or fled due to persecution, both political and religious (and often times both). The most famous British refugee to Geneva was the Scottish preacher John Knox (1514-72), who is represented today on Geneva's Reformation wall alongside Calvin, Theodore Beza, and Guillaume Farel.

The aftermath of the Henrician Reformation in England left the country in political and religious turmoil for many years following Henry's death.[220] His son, Edward VI, was a solid Protestant who supported continued reform. After his death, however, his half-sister Mary ascended the throne.[221] Mary was a loyal Catholic and was pejoratively titled 'Bloody Mary' due to her swift persecution of Protestants in England. Knox was soon forced to flee to Europe, making stops in Dieppe, Zurich, Emden and Geneva where he often heard the preaching of Calvin.[222] After visits around Europe and a short, yet

---

[219] P. Collinson, "England and International Calvinism, 1558-1640," in *International Calvinism*, p. 198.
[220] The Henrician Reformation has been covered extensively in many monographs and articles and is too cumbersome to be addressed here. For an account of recent trends in scholarship, as well as a good account of Henry VIII and his political, religious, and familial reforms, see R. Rex, *Henry VIII and the English Reformation* (2nd Edition, Basingstoke, 2006).
[221] Her enthronement was not without controversy as originally Edward had ensured that his cousin's daughter, Lady Jane Grey, would be crowned. Shortly after her accession, though, popular unrest led to Mary's crowning and Grey's imprisonment in the Tower of London: R. Marshall, *John Knox* (Edinburgh, 2000), pp. 59-61.
[222] J. Dawson, *John Knox* (Llandysul, 2015), pp. 82-9.

tumultuous time as the pastor to the English congregation in Frankfurt,[223] Knox accepted the position as minister to the English congregation in Geneva. Knox, writing to Anne Locke, said of Geneva, "I neither fear nor am ashamed to say, [Geneva] is the most perfect school of Christ that ever was in earth since the days of the Apostles. In other places, I confess Christ to be truly preached, but manners and religions so sincerely reformed, I have not yet seen in any other place."[224] Eventually Knox returned to Scotland after years of successful ministry in Geneva.

Knox has been called the "first of our great theological writers" of Scottish theology.[225] Though Torrance is quick to point out that there were many famous Scottish theologians before and during the Scottish Reformation, "John Knox made a unique contribution to the character and shape of the theology of the Reformed Church in Scotland."[226] The most obvious Reformed influence in Scotland came from the distribution of the Genevan *Catechism* of 1541, which was included with every printing

---

[223] The members of the English congregation in Frankfurt were in sharp disagreement over the use of the 1559 English prayer book, with Knox and others firmly against the more liturgical aspects of it. The opposing side included the likes of Richard Cox who wanted to abrogate the more Catholic aspects of the prayer book, while maintaining many of its liturgical practices. Both sides appealed to evangelical communities throughout Europe. The proponents of the prayer book appealed to their brothers in prison in England and their episcopal structure, while the opponents solicited the example of Geneva, which had a solidly presbyterian polity. Cox would eventually win and Knox was forced to leave the city: *Ibid*., pp. 90-108. In an interesting article, Trueman argues that Knox and other presbyterians and Puritans were actually more ecumenical than the Church of England because they did not require the episcopal structure which was "the instrument for state power and enforced conformity.": C. Trueman, "Puritanism as Ecumenical Theology," *Dutch Review of Church History*, 81 (2001), pp. 326-36.

[224] Marshall, *Knox*, p. 98 and Kirk, "Influence," p. 174.

[225] James Walker quoted in T. F. Torrance, *Scottish Theology* (Edinburgh, 1996), p. 1.

[226] Torrance mentions John Duns Scotus, Richard of St Victor and John Major as pre-Reformation examples: Torrance, *Scottish*, p. 1. Michael Lynch gives compelling evidence to refute the claim that Knox had such a profound effect on Scotland. He notes that the Scottish Reformation was variegated, with many Reformers coming from different backgrounds with various degrees of reform. For instance, the Scottish *Book of Discipline* (1560) "amply demonstrated the diversity of background and experience which characterized the first generation [of reformers]." The 'six Johns' who wrote the *Discipline* were Catholic Reformers (Douglas and Winram), one was a canon lawyer in Rome (Row), and three were Protestants who served the Church of England during Edward's reign: Lynch, "Scotland," p. 233. Even more, Maurice Taylor argues that Knox's historical importance may have been inflated simply due the preservation of his writings and ideas: Taylor, "Conflicting," p. 249.

of the *Book of Common Order* from 1562 to 1611.[227] Calvin's and Beza's writings were scarce in Scotland. The very few editions that existed were shared by the various clergy, but the *Catechism* helped solidify a "genuine Calvinist consensus" by 1580.[228] The Marian persecution of Protestants drew many more Scots to Geneva in order to experience this "maist perfyt schoole."[229] In addition, Knox and others kept in constant contact with Calvin, Beza, and other continental Reformers throughout the late sixteenth century.[230] One historian argues that without Knox the Scottish kirk would not have been a Reformed one. It surely would have been Protestant due to Queen Elizabeth's influence, but it would have been Anglican instead of Calvinist.[231] This claim may be too fanciful, as many ministers in England were Reformed in doctrine before Knox, while not adhering to a Presbyterian ecclesiology.[232] Scotland is, however, the most obvious nation in Great Britain that promoted explicitly Reformed doctrine. Scotland, though, did not merely replicate Geneva, as many native Scots took up the mantle of the Reformation and gave it a unique identity, at times in conflict with the desires of the greater Church of England.[233] For much of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the Church of England was embroiled in polemical and theological quarrels and though there was a vocal

---

[227] Lynch, "Scotland," p. 233.
[228] *Ibid*.
[229] Kirk, "Influence," p. 174.
[230] *Ibid*., pp. 174-5.
[231] J. Ridley, *John Knox* (Oxford, 1986), p. 528.
[232] Many of the reforms under Edward VI were thoroughly Reformed and would have had a stronger hold in England if not for Edward's premature death. Elizabeth's settlement, while Reformed, paved the way for a more distinct Church of England theology and ecclesiology: Benedict, *Christ's Churches*, p. 231.
[233] For a unique look at the various communities and dialects in Scotland and how the Reformed Tradition adapted to fit the needs of the community, see J. Dawson, "Calvinism and the Gaidhealtachd in Scotland," in *Calvinism in Europe*, pp. 231-53.

dissenting Reformed voice, especially in the Puritan community, there was never a unifying Church of England theology.[234]

In addition to Knox's influence in Scotland, Collinson argues that London was an essential asset in the eyes of Calvin. Collinson chronicles Calvin's dismay that Queen Elizabeth I was not as theologically sound as he had hoped and his desire was to strengthen doctrinal conformity in London.[235] The mainstream Church of England in the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries, though, in Collinson's view, "was putting down its anchors in the outer roads of the broad harbour of the Calvinist or (better) Reformed Tradition."[236] There is no doubt that the theology of Calvin and those reformers who came after him was adopted by many within the hierarchy of the Church of England. However, unlike Geneva and the Netherlands, the Church of England retained the episcopal structure of the Roman Church, spurning the Presbyterian style preferred, though not dogmatically, by Calvin. In the early seventeenth century, as stated previously, the Protestants pushing for further reforms, often referred to as Puritans, became highly vocal in England. These ministers and theologians, though, were highly independent of Genevan influence. For instance, William Perkins was a contemporary of Beza, yet is considered, by some, to have originated the "theological and pietistic"

---

[234] Collinson argues that the inclusion of "Puritanism" as "a church within the Church" produced a Church of England that, in the minds of late-sixteenth-century Britons, "was not Protestant at all but something called Anglicanism": P. Collinson, "England" in B. Scribner, *et al*. (eds), *The Reformation in National Context* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 90. Additionally, Scotland's multifaceted relationship with England at the end of the sixteenth century is illustrated by England's involvement in the expulsion of French influence in Scotland in 1558. Goodare writes, "The English ambassador was constantly in the corridors of power when the parliament of August 1560 enacted a new, Calvinist confession of faith, repealed anti-heresy laws, and repudiated the mass and papal authority. The English intervention was so decisive that, for the next generation, radical Scottish Protestants would be able to look to England for support whenever their own government showed signs of taking an independent line": J. Goodare, "Scotland," in B. Scribner, *et al*. (eds), *The Reformation in National Context* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 99-100.

[235] Collinson, "England," pp. 200-1.

[236] *Ibid*., p. 215.

aspects of Federal theology.[237] There was no doubt a steady stream of various theological treatises flowing in and out of England and one over-arching influence cannot be historically argued.

The Company of Pastors had a degree of authority in England and they made use of this when necessary. After the monarchy was restored in England, the Company of Pastors commissioned Turretin to write a letter to Charles II congratulating him on his reestablishment and on 24 August the Venerable Company received a reply.[238] In addition, in late 1685 the Company of Pastors prayed on behalf of England due to the death of Charles II.[239] They were clearly well informed on the various changes happening during England's Civil War.

Geneva's influence upon Great Britain, therefore, was, at best, sporadic. Unlike the churches in France, Scotland and England did not actively request Geneva's advice, though both nations were more than willing to send students to the academy.

The Netherlands, much like France, was heavily influenced by Geneva, though it was not wholly reliant upon the canton's resources for its livelihood or development. The Reformation in the Netherlands was very much an independent affair, beginning well before the Reformed doctrines entered the region.[240] There were several reasons in the early and mid-sixteenth century for religious reform in the Low Countries: sparse clerical availability, hypocritical and immoral clergy practices and the spread of humanism were

---

[237] Y. Song, *Theology and Piety in the Reformed Federal Thought of William Perkins and John Preston* (Lewiston, 1998), p. 30.
[238] AEG, RCP 11, ff. 124, 139. The letter was commissioned on 25 May 1660 and the King replied the following August.
[239] AEG, RCP 15, f. 87.
[240] J. Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall, 1477-1806* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 74-9.

amongst them.[241] Luther's protest had a profound effect upon the Dutch people, though. "Martin Luther, particularly the early Luther, exerted an enormous influence in the Low Countries with his resounding protest against the moral and religious decadence of the Church and by focusing attention on the Gospels."[242] Israel argues that Luther's ideas were propagated through early prints of his writings coming into the Netherlands at the initial stages of the Reformation. The Netherlanders had higher literacy rates than other nations of Early Modern Europe due to its highly urbanized demographics and the humanism of Dutch national Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536)[243] was already highly regarded. Therefore, when early editions of Luther's works came to Dort, Antwerp, and other cities it spread rapidly.[244] The Holy Roman Emperor Charles V (1500-58) began burning the books of Luther in the Netherlands and attempting to suppress the Lutheran sympathizers, burning two ministers at the stake in Brussels in July 1523.[245]

Throughout the sixteenth century, the Netherlands continued to import various Protestant works and major Zwinglian and Anabaptist[246] factions joined their Lutheran counterparts in the Low Countries. There was very little Reformed practice in the

---

[241] Israel notes that these problems were not new in the Netherlands, rather popular opinions were changing in favour of reform: *Ibid*., p. 76.
[242] *Ibid*., p. 79.
[243] Erasmus was a Dutch humanist who used critical editions of the Greek New Testament to produce a new translation. In addition, he founded the Collegium Trilingue at the University of Leuven for the study of Hebrew, Greek and Latin texts in the early Christian Tradition. Some early re-interpretations of traditional Catholic doctrine were established due to his translations: W. Blockmans, "The Formation of a Political Union, 1300-1600," in C. Blom and E. Lamberts (eds), *History of the Low Countries* (New York, NY, 1999), p. 126.
[244] Israel, *Dutch Republic*, pp. 79-80.
[245] *Ibid*., p. 82. Israel claims that these two deaths were the first Protestant martyrs from Western Europe.
[246] The famous Anabaptist leader Menno Simons (1496-1561) was a Dutch national who was ordained as a Catholic priest, but soon became disillusioned with the Catholic Church's teachings after questioning the doctrine of transubstantiation and reading, for the first time, the New Testament. Soon after he abandoned his post and began leading the "radical Reformation" in the Netherlands: C. Krahn, *Dutch Anabaptism: Origin, Spread, Life and Thought (1450-1600)* (The Hague, 1968), pp. 68-9.

Netherlands in the early and mid-sixteenth century.[247] However, towards the latter half of the sixteenth century Dutch refugees in Germany who were heavily influenced by Reformed theology during their time in Germany began re-entering the Netherlands and uniting Protestants under the theology of Geneva. Israel summarises the Reformed Tradition's movement in the Netherlands well. He writes:

> Doctrinally, the strength of Calvinism, which by the 1550s had eclipsed (but also absorbed) the Buceran and Zwinglian strands of the Reformation in northern Europe, sprang from its clear, systematic exposition, above all in Calvin's great work, the *Institutes*, its ability to provide that stable and orderly structure, both in dogma and organization, needed to counter the fragmentation, and proliferation of theological tendencies, so characteristic of the early Netherlands Reformation.[248]

The Reformed Tradition provided a rallying point for Dutch Protestants to unite around and soon Reformed theology and practice became the *de facto* religion of the Dutch Republic.

The Reformed churches of the Netherlands were relatively independent of direct Genevan influence, though there were certain characteristics of Dutch Reformed polity that resembled Geneva including the *coetus* which was similar to the Venerable Company of Pastors.[249] The Reformed church in Antwerp also requested that Geneva send a

---

[247] Duke describes the Dutch response to Calvinism as "sluggish" and that the "slow growth of the early Reformed congregations is unassailable": A. Duke, "The Ambivalent Face of Calvinism in the Netherlands, 1561-1618," in *International Calvinism*, p. 112.

[248] Israel, *Dutch*, p. 103. Van Deursen argues that the Reformed tradition "unquestionably slowed the growth of the Church" in the Netherlands due to 'Calvinism's' stress on 'choice' as a necessary aspect of becoming a Christian as opposed to inheriting faith through birth. This is surely an overgeneralisation at best, as Duke argues that the Reformed church struggled to gain a majority of Dutch people due to the Dutch Reformed's internal debate about how to live in the world, but be a 'called-out' people. Nevertheless, Reformed theology was victorious amongst the Protestant denominations: A. Van Deursen, "The Dutch Republic, 1588-1780," in C. Blom and E. Lamberts (eds), *History of the Low Countries* (New York, 1999), p. 152 and A. Duke, *Reformation and Revolt in the Low Countries* (London, 1990), p. 293.

[249] Duke, *Reformation*, p. 240.

minister to their city to pastor the flock, to which Geneva heartily agreed, and many pastors for both the Dutch and French speaking churches in Antwerp, known as Walloon churches, were educated at the Academy in Geneva.[250] It was, however, the Dutch who convened the highly influential Synod of Dort in which the Reformed understanding of election and predestination was most fully defined. As we will see in the next chapter, Geneva played an essential role in the Synod, but the city did not hold the centre position which was occupied by the followers of Franciscus Gomarus (1563-1641), known as the Counter-Remonstrants, and Dutch Counter-Remonstrant Johannes Bogerman (1576-1637), who presided.[251] The Reformed Orthodox at Dort solidified a wholly Dutch form of Reformed polity and it "brought in its wake not only efforts to eradicate Arminianism and cut back the toleration allowed to the dissenting Churches but also a first blast of pressure to goad the secular authorities into combating a range of behaviour which had previously been unrestricted or looked on with greater leniency."[252] The Company of Pastors in Geneva, though, were aware and concerned about the work of Arminius as early as 1608. In October of that year the Venerable Company noted the 'grande trouble' Arminius was causing in the Netherlands.[253] In summary, Geneva's influence in the Netherlands, as in France and Great Britain, was indirect, at best, and the Netherlands

---

[250] G. Marnef, "The Changing Face of Calvinism in Antwerp," in *Calvinism in Europe*, pp. 143-6. This is also true of other Dutch cities including Leiden which sent ministers to train in Geneva and Heidelberg: A. Pettegree, "Coming to Terms with Victory: The Upbuilding of a Calvinist Church in Holland, 1572-1590," in *Calvinism in Europe*, p. 167.

[251] Gomarus was chair of theology at the University of Leiden and he was a vocal opponent of his colleague, Jacob Arminius. This also highlights the one-sidedness of the proceeding. They certainly allowed Episcopus to make his case for 'Arminianism,' but it was hardly an objective setting: Duke, *Reformation*, p. 460.

[252] Israel, *Dutch Republic*, p. 476.

[253] AEG, RCP 5, f. 274.

must be seen as a co-equal companion to Geneva in the further propagation of the Reformed Tradition in Early Modern Europe.

The case of Genevan influence in Germany is a more complicated one. Luther's impact on the principalities of Germany was sustained to a much higher degree than in other areas of Western Europe. There were, however, successful pockets of Reformed churches spread throughout Germany. The impact of the Reformed Tradition centred mostly on the city of Brandenburg and the western areas of Germany. East Germany and Prussia resisted the 'Second Reformation'[254] with great force due to their adherence to Lutheranism and the surviving Catholicism of King Sigismund III of Poland (1566-1632).[255] Because of this, it is difficult to discern the direct influence Geneva exerted on these congregations. The Catholics of Germany considered the people from Geneva and the Netherlands to be 'outside agitators' and that the Catholic Church would not sit idly by while they continued to evangelize.[256] Much of the early influence upon Germany, however, came not from Geneva, but from the Netherlands. Many adherents of the Reformed Tradition fled to Germany when the Netherlands was being persecuted by the Catholic Church.[257] Here they were able to preach and convert both Lutherans and Catholics in spite of heavy opposition.[258] After a few important leaders in Brandenburg

---

[254] This moniker is commonly used to signify the difference between the Reformation of Martin Luther and the further reformations of the Reformed Tradition.
[255] B. Nischan, "Confessionalism and Absolutism: The Case of Brandenburg," in *Calvinism in Europe*, p. 182.
[256] *Ibid*., p. 187.
[257] This is commonly referred to as the Dutch Revolt, which began when 1555 when Holy Roman Emperor Charles V "renounced" his titles in the Low Countries to his son Philip II of Spain. Philip expanded the Catholic Church's inquisitorial role in the Netherlands leading to revolt amongst the Protestant leaders. The Revolt's conclusion came in 1581 when the treaty of Plessis-lès-Tours was signed and Philip II was renounced as ruler of the States General: M. van Gelderen, "Introduction," in M. van Gelderen (ed.), *The Dutch Revolt* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. ix-xxxiii.
[258] Nischan, "Confessionalism and Absolutism," p. 188.

were converted to the Reformed faith, a series of propagandist works were produced by both Reformed Protestants and Catholics, with Catholics warning against Protestant usurpation of the Habsburgs and evangelicals framing their cause as an "apocalyptic struggle between good and evil."[259]

Germany, however, appears to have had little direct influence from the governing powers in Geneva. The Second Reformation of Germany, in many ways, was led by Germans. One of the most influential was Zacharias Ursinus (1534-83).[260] In addition to Ursinus, there were many 'Crypto-Calvinists' from Germany who helped pave the way for a German Reformed movement, including Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531) and Philipp Melanchthon.[261] Another primary representative of the Second Reformation in Germany was John Sigismund (1572-1619), the Elector of Brandenburg. Sigismund was a strong Protestant, but he did not believe that Luther had fully stripped himself and the Church of Catholicism. He was convinced that Luther had "remained deeply stuck in the darkness of the papacy" and further Reform was drastically needed.[262] Sigismund used Germany's various academies to continue the Reformation. According to Nischan, Germany's famous Joachimsthal Gymnasium played a primary role in this attempted conversion. The Gymnasium was well endowed and had a principal who was thoroughly convinced

---

[259] *Ibid*.
[260] Ursinus was born in Breslau, Germany, and he would eventually study under the Lutheran Reformer Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560) at Wittenburg, under Calvin at Geneva, and, finally, under Jean Mercier in Paris. In 1561 he became professor at the Collegium Sapientiae in Heidelberg and he, along with Kaspar Olevian, would write the *Heidelberg Catechism* of 1563: L. D. Bierma, "Law and Grace in Ursinus' Doctrine of the Natural Covenant: A Reappraisal," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, pp. 96-7.
[261] H. Cohn, "The Territorial Princes in Germany's Second Reformation, 1559-1622," in *International Calvinism*, p. 144. It is, of course, anachronistic to call Melanchthon and Zwingli 'Calvinists' since they were born and ministered before Calvin. However, Cohn argues that these theologians left residues that would soon develop into Calvinism in Germany.
[262] B. Nischan, "The Schools of Brandenburg and the "Second Reformation": Centers of Calvinist Learning and Propaganda," in R. Schnucker (ed.), *Calviniana: Ideas and Influence of Jean Calvin*, Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, 10 (Kirksville, MO, 1988), p. 216.

by the Second Reformation. This Gymnasium did not look to the example of Geneva for its inspiration, however. Instead, when the Gymnasium was reformed, the Heidelberg Catechism became the standard.[263] The Helvetic formulas were not needed in Germany; they were able adequately to implement their own confessions in order to maintain discipline. There was, therefore, a strong indigenous 'German Calvinism' operating independently of the Genevan Church with its own centres of learning, its own provincial rulers, and its own evangelical theologians.[264]

Though Germany had, in many ways, an autonomous church, the leaders of Geneva were aware and interested in the continuing development of the Reformed movement there. In Geneva, as with other nationalities, there was a significant constituency of German refugees, and many ministers in Geneva requested to preach at the German congregation in Geneva throughout the 1650s.[265] The Company of Pastors was also keenly aware of the wars ravaging other parts of Western Europe. At the conclusion of the Thirty Years War (1618-48), the Company of Pastors sent a letter to the Elector of the Palatinate, Charles I Louis, congratulating him on his successful reestablishment of Heidelberg, and especially the return of the 'true religion' after Heidelberg had been

---

[263] *Ibid*., pp. 218-20. The Heidelberg Catechism was commissioned by the Elector of the Palatinate, Frederick III. There were three objectives for his catechism: "that it serve as a *catechetical tool* for teaching the children, as a *preaching guide* for instructing the common people in the churches, and as a *form for confessional unity* among the several Protestant factions in the Palatinate." The theological confession to which the *Catechism* corresponds, however, is difficult to ascertain. At points it straddles the Lutheran-Reformed line while never descending into polemics against Roman Catholics or the Radical Reformers. "If one still insists on using labels, the most that should be said is that the Heidelberg Catechism was a Melanchthonian-Reformed gloss on the altered Augsburg Confession—but a gloss that emphasized consensus among the Melanchthonians, Calvinists, and Zwinglians in [Frederick's] realm." For the first quotation see L. Bierma, *An Introduction to the Heidelberg Catechism*: *Sources, History, and Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2005), p. 51, for the second quotation see *Ibid*., p. 102.

[264] See Cohn, "Germany."

[265] On 22 July 1644 the German Church in Geneva requested that their minister, Mr Amberg, be elected to the Company of Pastors. Though the Company recognized the pastor's piety and erudition, it refused his request for multiple reasons: AEG, RCP 9, f. 51. There are requests beginning in February of 1652: AEG, RCP 10, f. 7.

conquered by the Catholic Habsburgs.[266] Three years later the company again wrote to the Elector Palatine to congratulate him on the restoration of the city of Frankendal.[267] Whether these letters were received by the Elector is uncertain. However, it is clear that the Company believed that it was important to stay on friendly terms with the Palatinate for ecclesial and/or political reasons.[268] In addition, the Company records two instances in which German cities requested their aid; the city of Magdeburg and the Duke and Duchess of Mecklenburg, most likely Gustav Adolph (1633-95) and his wife Magdalene (1631-1719), both appealed to the Company, but for different reasons.[269] Unfortunately, it is impossible to understand fully what they were requesting as the handwriting of the secretary of the Company of Pastors is nearly illegible. However, it appears that they both requested aid from the Company and that the Company responded in kind, first loaning the Duchess twenty-six hundred florins, and then granting the Magdeburg request, whatever it was.

Similar to France and the Netherlands, then, the city of Geneva had little influence upon Germany. There was sustained correspondence between the Company of Pastors and various cities, the exchange of preachers, and the import and export of students, but one cannot claim that Geneva held any unique place amongst the German Reformed. As the city of Calvin it held a place of importance and the Academy remained an important

---

[266] AEG, RCP 9, f. 243 (2 November 1649). The Habsburgs were a dynasty of Kings, Emperors and rulers beginning in the mid-Middle Ages. The most prominent portion of their dynastic rule began in 1519 when Charles V became the Holy Roman Emperor: R. J. W. Evans, *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy, 1550-1700: An Interpretation* (Oxford, 1979), p. xxii.
[267] AEG, RCP 10, f. 23 (21 May 1652).
[268] I am more inclined towards political motives as both letters were written in response to political victories by the Elector. However, due to the ecclesial nature of the Company of Pastors it is highly probable that the letter served to strengthen both political and ecclesial ties.
[269] AEG, RCP 9, ff. 104, 140, 355.

centre of learning, but the Reformed of Germany were very much in charge of their own development throughout the Early Modern Period.

The spread of Protestantism, in general, in Eastern Europe was more of an ecumenical affair than in other areas of Europe. The Reformed church was relatively slow in reaching Poland, Hungary, and Bohemia[270]; Evans notes that very few Hungarians had any contact with Calvin directly.[271] Though Calvin himself was not instrumental in the Reformation of the Eastern block of Europe, Switzerland was, especially Zurich. In 1549 Heinrich Bullinger (1504-75) sent the *Consensus Tigurinus* to Eastern Europe, Hungary in particular.[272] The *Consensus* was agreed upon by Bullinger, Calvin and William Farel, and it solidified the Reformed doctrine of the sacraments, especially the sacrament of Holy Communion, against the Roman and Lutheran definitions. After it was officially accepted in Zurich, Geneva, Neuchâtel and Basel (though not right away), it helped unify the Swiss churches under Reformed theology.[273] For most of the sixteenth century, however, Reformed polity moved slowly through Eastern Europe and there was hardly a theologian or minister who could be considered wholly Reformed.[274] As in the examples of the other nation states of Early Modern

---

[270] Of course, Bohemia had its own, earlier reformer in Jan Hus (1369-1415) who was burnt at the stake as a heretic, as well as two pre-Hus reformers in John Milíč (1305-1374) and Matthew of Janov (d. 1393): F. Kavka, "Bohemia," in B. Scribner, *et al*. (eds), *The Reformation in National Context* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 131-54.
[271] R. J. W. Evans, "Calvinism in East Central Europe: Hungary and Her Neighbours," in *International Calvinism*, p. 171.
[272] *Ibid*., p. 171.
[273] P. Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes* (3 vols, New York, NY, 1877), I p. 472. The Roman position is transubstantiation: during the mass, when the priest consecrates the bread and wine, it physically becomes the body and blood of Christ. Though the accidents remain bread and wine, the actual substance becomes the body and blood of Christ. The Lutheran definition is sacramental union: when the bread and wine are consecrated they become unified with the body and blood of Christ through his first communion. It is a very delicate balance, but the Lutheran definition still tends to promote a substantial change in the bread and wine into the actual body and blood of Christ.
[274] Evans, "East Central Europe," pp. 176-7.

Europe, Hungary, Poland, and Eastern Europe had their fair share of native Reformed ministers.[275] However, Eastern Europe was never able to unite properly around Reformed Christianity.

Perhaps the most fruitful influence upon Early Modern Eastern Europe came not from Geneva, but England in the form of the 'Puritans.' The Reformation in Hungary was generally "very incomplete" and Papal influence continued to spread. The Puritans, in Evans's estimation, offered what this first Reformation did not: a moral reformation, "with a programme for the removal of superstition and establishment of a godly polity regulated by an alliance of intellectuals, lesser clergy, and common citizenry."[276] Indeed, Hungary's foreign theology came not via Calvin, but through the Englishman William Ames (1576-1633). Ultimately, though, the Reformed Tradition had little impact upon Hungary and Eastern Europe and the influence of the Puritans soon waned as ethnic communities began to solidify. Hungarians tended to be Reformed and Lutheran, or at least Protestant, but there was enough cultural variety to make any authoritative conclusion tenuous.[277] For Evans, the Protestant movement, and the Reformed Tradition in general, were simply too diverse to establish a unified Hungarian, Polish, or Bohemian Reformed Church.[278] Even amongst the Reformed strands of Christianity in Eastern Europe, it is simply a misnomer to refer to them as 'Calvinist.' There were too many

---

[275] For instance, Hungary had two native ministers who evangelised during the sixteenth century: Márton Kálmáncsehi Sánta (d. 1557) and István Szegedi Kis (1505-72): K. Peter, "Hungary," in B. Scribner, *et al*. (eds), *The Reformation in National Context* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 161.
[276] *Ibid*., p. 185.
[277] Daniel notes that there was some debate between the Reformed and the "Philippist Lutherans", following Melanchthon, on one side, and Lutherans following Luther, on the other side, on the Ubiquity of Christ's body in the Eucharist, making any singular 'Lutheran' body difficult to define in Hungary: see D. Daniel, "Calvinism in Hungary: The Theological and Ecclesiastical Transition to the Reformed Faith," in *Calvinism in Europe*, p. 230.
[278] Peter, "Hungary," pp. 192-3.

influences upon the Hungarian churches, for example, to elevate Calvin to a preeminent position.[279]

The final international example we will need to examine in order to have a thorough understanding of the influence of Geneva is North America. Though in its infancy at the beginning of Calvin's ascendency in Geneva, by the time of Turretin there was a significant population amongst the various colonies and Reformed theology was being imported through America's colonial community. Unlike the communities of Early Modern Europe, the Colonies of North America had no contact with the Genevan clergy. For the most part the American Reformed were influenced by the English divines of Cambridge. Similarly to Early Modern Europe, and against the modern polemic of America as a 'Christian nation,' the Colonies were a highly variegated community in terms of religion. The Massachusetts Bay colony was mostly Puritan, Virginia was mostly Church of England, Pennsylvania was Quaker, and Maryland was Catholic; these colonies were hardly united under any one church. Even amongst the Reformed of colonial New England there was doctrinal disparity. Speck and Billington write:

> The doctrinal flexibility of Calvinism as it developed in seventeenth-century New England stretched beyond the covenant of grace to sacramental theology. Like Calvin, New England theologians recognized only two sacraments, baptism and communion. Their attitudes towards both, however, were highly ambivalent. On the one hand they were not means of grace necessary to salvation, as Catholics insisted. Yet on the other hand they had a sacramental role. Upholders of New England orthodoxy maintained against Antinomians and Baptists that the two sacraments were seals to the covenant. They did not create, but they endorsed membership of the church.[280]

---

[279] Daniel, "Calvinism in Hungary," p. 205.
[280] W. Speck and L. Billington, "Calvinism in Colonial North America, 1630-1715," in *International Calvinism*, p. 261.

In addition to sacramental ambiguity, ecclesial polity was often unclear. When the Congregationalists of Massachusetts quelled nonconformity they appealed to Calvin. But Roger Williams (1603-83)—the Massachusetts tolerationist—argued that one did not need to "slavishly" follow Calvin in order to be a good Calvinist.[281] For the Dutch Reformed in America the Canons of the Synod of Dort and the Heidelberg Catechism were normative standards.[282] There was, therefore, knowledge of Calvin and a self-awareness to the Colonial Congregationalists that they were, at least, attempting to follow the example of the Genevan reformer. However, there appears to be no direct correspondence between the American colonies and the Swiss canton. The next chapter will illustrate Geneva's role in the Synod of Dort, but it can be concluded that this Synod is the only ancillary connection that the colonists had to the city of Geneva.

Overall, we can conclude that the city of Geneva's impact upon Early Modern Europe was indirect, at best, and that the idea of Geneva as the "Protestant Rome" is relevant only in terms of what Protestants *felt* and not in terms of how church polity or theology was administered. This is certainly true of seventeenth-century Geneva. After Calvin and Beza had passed away, the various state-churches very much controlled themselves through the development of confessionalisation and state-building. The French convened several national Synods, the Swiss continued to issue their own Confessions (as we shall see with Turretin and the *Consensus*), and England attempted to deal with its own internal strife through the Lambeth Articles, issued in 1595.[283] Therefore, we can

---

[281] *Ibid*., p. 263.
[282] *Ibid*., p. 276.
[283] The Lambeth Articles were written to "correct perceived inadequacies in the Thirty-Nine Articles' treatment of election and reprobation and, more immediately, to settle the growing controversy over

conclude that Geneva's influence upon Early Modern Europe was minimal, at least directly. Through printing books of theology and correspondence, individual ministers and theologians were able to influence various communities; but the Genevan clergy did not have the unifying impact that it once had under the formidable personalities of Calvin and Beza.

II. The Churches of Geneva

For much of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the churches in Geneva were regulated by the Vénérable Company of Pastors and the Councils of the city.[284] In many ways, the Company rivalled the Consistory in terms of influence during Calvin's time. For several years, the Company maintained a 'dual identity,': "at once the local ministry and a missionary enterprise for France."[285] However, by the beginning of the seventeenth century the Company of Pastors' influence upon Early Modern Europe began to wane. As argued above, many of the Reformed movements throughout Europe had become self-sustaining and Geneva's main export country, France, was able to provide for itself. What was the Company of Pastors' role in Geneva, then? What was its main purpose during the seventeenth century? In the next chapter we will see that Turretin played an important role in the Company throughout the mid-seventeenth century. It is important,

---

predestination which had developed at the University of Cambridge": V. C. Miller, *The Lambeth Articles: Doctrinal Development and Conflict in 16th Century England*, Latimer Studies 44-5 (Oxford, 1994), p. 38.

[284] Maag notes that the pastors were paid by the city magistrates while simultaneously being overseen by the Company of Pastors: K. Maag, "From Professors to Pastors: The Convoluted Careers of Jean Diodati and Théodore Tronchin," in J. Ballor, *et al*. (eds), *Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism: Studies in Honor of Richard A. Muller on the Maturation of a Theological Tradition* (Leiden, 2013), p. 245.

[285] G. Lewis, "Calvinism in Geneva in the Time of Calvin and of Beza (1541-1605)," in *International Calvinism*, p. 47.

therefore, to gain a thorough understanding of its role in Geneva and the greater Reformed Tradition in Early Modern Europe.

To the great fortune of the researcher, the Company of Pastors took copious notes and they were well preserved by the *Archives d'Etat* of Geneva. In addition, a previous editor of the Registers made notes on several editions clarifying the writings of the original author. One common obstacle the researcher must overcome in analysing the Registers is the occasionally poor handwriting of the original secretary of the Company. This makes the editors notes invaluable in understanding the purpose of the meetings. Furthermore, the editor created a detailed index of names and proper nouns that frequently appear in each Register book. The Registers are, therefore, fairly accessible when one is curious of the issues that occupied the time of the Company. This section will seek to chart broadly the affairs that engaged the Company and, when possible, it will illuminate the decisions made by the Company in order to come to conclusions about its importance to Geneva overall.

In the early years of the Company of Pastors, which began as a meeting of the clergy and religious faculty in the 1540s,[286] it was required that every pastor attend the meetings; if they did not, there could be severe consequences. This was true for the rural pastors, as well, though their attendance requirements were slightly more lenient than those imposed upon the urban ministers. In the *Ecclesiastical Ordinances of 1541*, Calvin elaborated the requirements: "No one should be absent without a legitimate reason. If anyone be negligent in this respect, let him be admonished. As for those who preach in the villages, subordinate to the seigneury, they are to be exhorted to come as

[286] S. Manetsch, *Calvin's Company of Pastors: Pastoral Care and the Emerging Reformed Church, 1536-1609* (Oxford, 2013) [hereafter *Company*], p. 28.

often as they can. However, if they default an entire month, it is to be regarded as a very great negligence, unless it is a case of illness or another legitimate hindrance."[287] The full Company of Pastors was never very large as Geneva itself was not particularly big for its time.[288] Most years the Company would consist of roughly ten city ministers and ten rural ministers. In addition, the Company included a small number of professors from the Academy, usually around four.[289]

Originally, the *Ordinances* established the *Congrégation* which was to meet a certain day of the week for Bible study and discussion.[290] "The Congregation, patterned after Zurich's *Prophezei*, was intended to be a kind of adult Bible study where ministers and interested laypeople listened to the exposition of Scripture by one of the city's ministers, then discussed the matters of exegesis and theology related to the chosen passage."[291] Interestingly, the *Congrégation* was regularly attended by more laypeople than pastors.[292] Though it cannot be said that a majority of laypersons attended the *Congrégation*, it shows the people of Geneva's general interest in biblical teaching and their desire to have their say in such matters. In fact, de Boer indicates that lay attendance affected the order of study in order "that they who in the following may frequent the biblical studies may have a clear ease and learn better how they should read both the histories and the

---

[287] E. de Boer, "The Presence and Participation of Laypeople in the *Congrégations* of the Company of Pastors in Geneva," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 35 (2004), p. 652.
[288] Watt argues that Geneva in 1500 only had about 10-12,000 citizens. This is in contrast to Paris at the time which had a population of well over 200,000: J. Watt, *Choosing Death: Suicide and Calvinism in Early Modern Geneva* (Kirksville, MO, 2001), p. 8.
[289] *Company*, p. 2.
[290] The text reads: "[13] Premièrement sera expedient que tous les ministres, pour conserver pureté et concorde de doctrine entre eux, conviennent ensemble un jour certain [de] la semaine, pour avoir conference des Ecritures et que nul ne s'en exempte, s'il n'a excuse légitime. Si quelqu'un y était negligent, qu'il en soit admonesté": H. Heyer, *L'Église de Genève: Equisse Historique de son Organisation* (Geneva, 1909), p. 263.
[291] *Company*, p. 28.
[292] de Boer, "Laypeople," p. 653.

doctrine, which are so intertwined."[293] This shows the twofold nature of the Company: first, they were expositors of the whole canon of the Bible, Old and New Testaments; second, they were keen to instruct the laity. The Company was illustrating their internalisation of the Reformation principles of biblical authority and empowerment of the individual believer.[294]

The *Congrégation* continued to meet well into the seventeenth century. In 1612 the *Congrégation* studied the twelve Minor Prophets (the OT books of Hosea through Malachi)[295] and some of the Pauline Epistles, including Romans;[296] concurrently in 1612, two pastors requested that they be exempted from the previous week's *Congrégation* without penalty. First was a new preacher, Etienne Girard, who was not granted an exemption because "les autres n'ont eu ce privilege."[297] The second, Jacques Sartois, was granted an exemption due to "empechements au remuements mesnages."[298] Both pastors were new to the Company, but clearly the pastors of seventeenth-century Geneva took the exhortation in the *Ordinances* of strict attendance just as seriously as those during Calvin's time.[299] For the next fifty years, the *Congrégation* continued without interruption and the Registers 1658-1670 do not even mention the meetings at all. In 1670 the Company debated whether they should finish the fifty-second chapter of the

---

[293] *Ibid*.
[294] Indeed, de Boer illustrates this with his example of a former Catholic priest visiting the *Congrégation* and writing in a letter that members of the public were allowed to speak and offer their interpretation in addition to the interpretations being offered by the Pastors. Furthermore, it was at a meeting of the *Congrégation* that Jerôme Bolsec made his infamous critique of Predestination and was arrested: *Ibid*., pp. 655, 660-1.
[295] AEG, RCP 6, f. 3. "A esté advisé que l'on exposeroit ci apres en la *Congrégation*, les douze petis Prophetes."
[296] *Ibid*., f. 180.
[297] *Ibid*., f. 225.
[298] *Ibid*., f. 230.
[299] Girard was ordained as a pastor to the congregation in Russin, a rural parish, on 20 November 1618 and Sartoris was ordained a city pastor on 29 October 1619: Heyer, *L'Église*, pp. 198, 213.

Book of Jeremiah or move on to another book. It was decided that they would move on to Lamentations and it would be the duty of the pastors to preach on the final chapter of Jeremiah when time permitted.[300] After Lamentations they moved onto the Psalm 2,[301] and then the Gospel of St John.[302] The Company of Pastors, therefore, was dedicated to the public preaching and analysis of the Holy Scriptures. The meetings of the *Congrégation* were intrinsic to the continued sanctification of the pastors and people of Geneva.

The *Ecclesiastical Ordinances* were central to the structure of pastoral care in Calvin's Geneva. The *Ordinances* categorized pastoral duties into four offices: pastor, doctor, elder and deacon.[303] For Calvin and the early Reformed movement, "si nous voulons avoir l'Eglise bien ordonnée et l'entretenir en son entier, il nous faut observer cette forme de régime."[304] The ordaining of pastors was a rigorous process that maintained doctrinal purity and required that each candidate take an exam in order to prove their knowledge of doctrine and their ability to teach it to the people, and to determine whether the person's life was above reproach.[305] At any time the other pastors, council or congregation could rule the candidate unworthy and he would be rejected.

---

[300] "Le texte de la congregation escheant au 51 chap. de Jer. sur la fin et le 52 contenant presques les mesmes matieres et des mesmes termes qui ont esté aux chap. precedents. A esté proposé comment on traittera les textes restons. Advisé qu'on laisse a la prudence des freres qui au sont a prescher d'expose le dernier chapitre a une fois ou autrement": AEG, RCP 12, ff. 497-8 (4 March 1670). Amongst the pastors in attendance was Francis Turretin.
[301] *Ibid*., ff. 573-4 (10 December 1670).
[302] *Ibid*., ff. 589, 592 (10 February 1671).
[303] *Company*, p. 28. The original text is copied in Heyer, *L'Église*, pp. 260-76: "Premièrement il y a quatre ordres d'offices que notre Seigneur a institué pour le gouvernement de son Eglise, à savoir: [2] Les pasteurs, puis les docteurs, après les anciens, autrement nommés commis par la Seigneurie, quartement les diacres."
[304] Heyer, *L'Église*, p. 262.
[305] "l'examen contient deux parties dont la première est touchant la doctrine, à savoir si celui qu'on doit ordonner a bonne et saine connaissance de l'Ecriture. Et puis s'il est idoine et proper pour la communiquer au peuple en édification. La seconde partie est de la vie, à savoir: s'il est de bonne moeurs et s'est touhours gouverné sans reproche.": *Ibid*.

After being ordained through the laying on of hands, the *Ordinances* clarify the process by which a minister could be defrocked. Amongst the various "crimes" are heresy, schism, rebellion against the ecclesiastical order, blasphemy, simony, the desire to take someone else's office, and neglecting one's church. Second order offenses included strange interpretations, especially those that led to scandals, seeking vain questions, advancing a non-approved church doctrine, or neglecting to read the Holy Scriptures.[306] Censuring various pastors or professors was not uncommon. In the Registers from 1665-71 there were eighteen pages in which censures were discussed, including censures of several city regents for "leaving the infants of the Reformed out in the cold" because they did not replace the windows of the children's home.[307]

The doctors were meant "to teach healthy doctrine so that the purity of the Gospel is not corrupted by ignorance or evil opinions."[308] In many ways the doctors were the precursor to the professors of the forthcoming Academy. Since the Academy was not founded until 1559, the doctors were meant to teach both young children and those preparing for the ministry. Though doctors and professors were two separate offices, Manetsch notes that practically these two offices, that is, doctors and professors, were often occupied by the same person. "Calvin believed that this was true of his own vocation: God had called him to be both pastor *and* teacher in the Genevan church."[309] Indeed, this would become standard practice throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Theodore Beza, Jean Diodati, Louis Tronchin, and Benedict and Francis Turretin, along with many others, would occupy both posts throughout their tenures. In

---

[306] *Ibid*.
[307] AEG, RCP 12, f. 31.
[308] Heyer, *L'Église*, p. 266.
[309] *Company*, p. 29.

the seventeenth century it became commonplace for the Company of Pastors to approve professors through an examination and election. Turretin would go through this process after the conclusion of his studies, as the next chapter will illustrate.

The third office, the elders, was deputised by the Lords of the Councils, not by the other members of the Company of Pastors. They were called "to take care of everyone's life, lovingly admonishing those who fail or have a disordered life."[310] The *Ordinance* does not offer any timeline of when elders were to be discharged, or any guidelines on holy living, as was given to pastors. In fact, the *Ordinances* warn against changing elders often, especially if the elders are faithfully carrying out their vocation.[311] The *Ordinances* do give a brief instruction on who to choose and from where. It reads:

> Comme cette Eglise est disposée, il sera bon d'en élire deux du Conseil étroit, quatre du Conseil des Soixante et six du Conseil des Deux Cents, gens de bonne vie et honnêtes, sans reproche et hors de tout suspection, surtout craignant Dieu et ayant bonne prudence spirituelle. Et les faudra telement élire qu'il y en ait un en chacun quartier de la ville, afin d'avoir l'oeil partout; ce que voulons être fait.[312]

The *Ordinances* clearly intended, then, that the enforcement of discipline be paramount in Geneva, and each area of the city would have its own elder acting as sheriff of the Godly life. By the 1650s it was very uncommon for elders to be elected. The Lords were forced to assign two new elders due to the deaths of the previous occupants. This was the

---

[310] "Leur office est de prendre garde sur la vie d'un chacun, d'admonester amiablement ceux qu'ils verront faillir et mener vie désordonnée." *EO*: 36, found in Heyer, *L'Église*, p. 267.
[311] *EO*: 38.
[312] *EO*: 37.

only time from 1654-58 that the Consistory discussed electing elders.[313] These elders now sat on the important governing body: the Consistory.

The Consistory has had a problematic reputation in the historiography of Early Modern Geneva due to some unhelpful definitions by historians. As the introductory chapter noted,[314] the Consistory in some areas of Early Modern historiography was seen as a theocratic institution, intent on hunting down and punishing sinners. The reality of the situation is much different, however. One such example is the issue of suicide in sixteenth-century Geneva. Jeffrey Watt notes that many historical works have blamed Reformed theology, especially its emphasis on double predestination, as the major cause of suicide due to the anxiety it placed on the believer.[315] After thoroughly examining many suicides in Early Modern Geneva, Watt concluded that suicides rose drastically in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries due to "a combination of social, economic, political, legal and above all cultural factors," diverging from the view that the Consistory and a strong theological consensus were overly burdensome.[316] Indeed, it was simply never the intention of the Consistory to be a punishing institution. "The Consistory had no power to impose corporal punishment; it had authority to wield only 'the spiritual sword of the Word of God.'"[317] In the *Ecclesiastical Ordinances* of 1576 the definition of the work of the Consistory is elaborated on. It shall consist of the elders and ministers and meet every Thursday "to see if there is any disorder in the church, whether general or in particular, in order to treat remedies when and as they are

---

[313] AEG, RCons. 57, f. 17.
[314] Ch. 1, pp. 45-6.
[315] Watt, *Suicide*, pp. 11-12.
[316] *Ibid*., p. 326.
[317] *Company*, p. 29.

necessary."[318] The Consistory continued to take its role very seriously during the seventeenth century and members continued to meet regularly up until the twentieth century.[319]

Kingdon has highlighted some important problems concerning nineteenth and early twentieth-century readings of the Registers of the Consistory. First, much secondary literature depended on the edited volumes of a nineteenth-century Genevan called Cramer. Kingdon notes that Cramer's work was highly inadequate, often omitting the mundane aspects of the Consistory in favour of the "spectacular" and "lurid."[320] This created a somewhat distorted view of the Consistory during the time of Calvin, resulting in a totalitarian reading of its work. Kingdon, along with a team of colleagues, has begun the work of transcribing and publishing the sixteenth-century registers, but the nature of the Consistory during the seventeenth century is still in shadow. However, one can see that many of the members of the Consistory during the seventeenth century also served as either pastor, professor or both. For instance, on 25 August 1653 Theodore Tronchin served on the Consistory. Tronchin simultaneously served as pastor in the city of Geneva (beginning in 1608) and as Professor of Theology at the Acadmey (beginning in 1606).[321] Other notable persons serving in dual roles on the same day were Philipp Mestrezat (pastor and professor) and André Pictet (pastor and professor). This illustrates the continued consolidation of power into an oligarchy. While this was no doubt beneficial since all the members would have known each other very well, it raises several problems,

---

[318] Found in Heyer, *L'Église*, p. 294 ("pour voir s'il y a quelque désordre en l'Eglise, soit en général ou en particulier pour traiter des remèdes, quand et selon qu'il en sera besoin").
[319] The final uploaded copy of the Registers of the Consistory on the AEG of Geneva is 6 February 1906. AEG, RCons. 128, f. 197.
[320] R. Kingdon, "The Genevan Consistory in the time of Calvin," in *Calvinism in Europe*, p. 23.
[321] AEG, RCons. 56, f. 215.

corruption and nepotism amongst them. The most problematic, however, is the careful balance that would need to be maintained between the few families. If someone's theology was not allied with the other members a quarrel could ensue and this would likely mean that factions would develop. This precarious situation will come into play during Turretin's tenure in Geneva, especially as theological innovations flourished.

The final office was that of the deacons. The *Ordinances* read:

> Il y en a eu toujours deux espèces en l'Eglise ancienne; les uns ont été deputes à recevoir, dispenser et conserver les biens des pauvres, tant aumônes quotidiennes que possessions, rentes et pensions. Les autres pour soigner et panser les maladies et administrer la pittance des pauvres, la quelle coutume nous tenons encore de présent et afin d'éviter confusion.[322]

The authority for electing deacons was given over to the Consistory, but it was intended that St Paul's guidelines from 1 Timothy 3:8-13 be used.[323] This new office was split into two distinct roles: the procurator, the one who receives, dispenses and conserves the welfare of the poor; and the hospitaller, who treats and heals the sick. In sixteenth-century Geneva these roles were primarily carried out at the General Hospital.[324] Kingdon argues that Calvin's work in the *Ordinances* was not unique; that is, he did not create a new office in Geneva during his time. Instead, he consecrated already

---

[322] *EO*: 39.

[323] Verses 8-13 read, "Deacons, likewise must be serious, not double-tongued, not indulging in much wine, not greedy for money; they must hold fast to the mystery of the faith with a clear conscience. And let them first be tested; then, if they prove themselves blameless, let them serve as deacons. Women, likewise must be serious, not slanderers, but temperate, faithful in all things. Let deacons be married only once, and let them manage their children and their households well; for those who serve as deacons gain a good understanding for themselves and great boldness in the faith that is in Christ Jesus." NIV.

[324] Robert Kingdon has done extensive research into the *Hôpital General* in Calvin's Geneva and I am relying heavily upon his research for this section: see R. Kingdon, "Social Welfare in Calvin's Geneva," *The American Historical Review*, 76 (1971), pp. 50-69 and *idem*, "Calvinism and Social Welfare," *Calvin Theological Journal*, 17 (1982), pp. 212-30.

established institutions. "He persuaded the Genevans that their new institutions were holy creations, in unique conformity with the Word of God."[325] The General Hospital was intended to provide aid to the native, poor Genevans. Geneva during the sixteenth century was a rather cramped place, unable to meet the demands of a growing population. In addition, this growing population was mostly due to immigrants flooding the city. This caused some inner turmoil between the native Genevan-born and immigrant populations.[326] The Hospital was only ever meant to be a means of short-term assistance, no more, really, than three days at a time. The influx of immigrants without adequate accommodation meant that the Hospital would be stretched to its limits. It became exceedingly obvious, then, that the role of the diaconate would need to be expanded in order to meet the needs of the growing immigrant populations.

The most prominent example of the expansion of the diaconate to meet the needs of the poor is the institutions of the French *bourse*. The *bourse* was intended to be a separate fund from that which funded the Hospital and it was to be used exclusively to help the poor French immigrants. Soon three prominent French immigrants were ordained as deacons and given control of the *bourse* and its endowment. By the 1570s the Company of Pastors records that it became necessary to expand the number of deacons serving the French refugees due to their increase in number.[327] This became standard practice with the guidelines of the *Bourse française* of 1581, which required the

[325] Kingdon, "Calvinism and Social Welfare," p. 220.
[326] In 1555 these tensions came to fruition when Ami Perrin, an influential Genevan businessman, gathered a crowd in the streets of Geneva and began yelling, "kill the french!" This rebellion was quashed by other Genevans and many of the perpetrators were either killed or exiled: *Ibid*., p. 224.
[327] AEG, RCP 2, f. 74 (January 1573).

reauthorisation of each deacon and the reassessment of the needs of the *bourse*.[328] By the 1650s, the *bourse* was still in operation and in 1659 the Company had a Conference concerning not only the French *Bourse*, but also the Italian and German *Bourses*, as well.[329] Therefore, the deacons provided an invaluable service to the people of Geneva. Unlike the other offices of the pastorate, the deacons were called to serve the poor in very practical ways. The pastors, teachers and elders maintained pastoral, theological, and ethical norms, while the deacons provided for the material welfare of the people. By the time of Turretin in the mid-1600s, the pastors, doctors, elders, and deacons had become an intrinsic part of Genevan culture and life. The offices of the 1541 *Ordinances* were successfully established in the "Protestant Rome" with the hopes that theological and ecclesiastical polity would remain pure for generations to come.

The final governing bodies of Geneva that will need to be examined are the Civic councils. There were three main councils, the Petit Council, around twenty-five members, the Council of Sixty and the Council of Two Hundred. As noted above, the *Ordinances* of 1541 required that the eldership come from the three councils, two people from each. This caused the governing structures of the Church and State to become even more enmeshed. Though this strong establishment of a State Church is difficult for the modern westerner to comprehend, it is, of course, not irregular to the Early Modern State. As argued in the previous chapter,[330] it was important for governing bodies to

---

[328] "Que le nombre des diacres sera de cinq pour le present et leur charge annuelle et qu'au commencement de chascune annee on eslira ou confermera ceulx de l'annee precedente tous ou partie." Quoted in J. Olson, *Calvin and Social Welfare: Deacons and the Bourse française* (London, 1989), p. 206.
[329] AEG, RCP 11, f. 58. The Registers from 1665-71 have extensive records concerning the *Bourse française*. The first entry records the resignations of Jacques Sartoris and Louis Tronchin from assisting the *Bourse* and the Hospital and the nominations of Deppren and Calandrin to take their places: AEG, RCP 12, f. 53.
[330] Ch. 1, pp. 48-55.

confessionalise, as it established a unifying discipline for the state to build on. Unfortunately for Geneva, the *Ordinances* of 1541 did not adequately define all of the duties assigned to each office. As Hughes writes, "the marriage between church and state in Geneva, however ideal in theory, was not one of uninterrupted harmony in day to day experience. Personality of genius though he was, there is plenty of evidence to demonstrate the falsity of the fashionable assertion that it was Calvin who always called the tune and tyrannically governed the life of the Genevan republic."[331] The most ambiguous duty, which was not properly delegated to either the Consistory or the Councils, was excommunication.

One of the primary complications of the structure of power in Geneva during Calvin's time is the fact that Geneva was well on its way to being self-sufficient before Calvin first arrived. "Thus, by 1526, the primary political institutions of the future republic were in place, namely the Small Council (made up of four syndics and twenty senators); the Council of Sixty (the Small Council, supplemented by thirty-five representatives from the Council of 200); the Council of 200 (consisting of elected representatives from every neighborhood in the city); and the General Assembly (comprising all the citizens and burghers in the city)."[332] As with the Consistory and the other councils, familial accord or strife could cause major turmoil in the city. Manetsch recounts one such occasion in which the pastors of the city refused the Lord's Supper to Philibert Berthelier who had ridiculed a minister in public and denounced the doctrine of predestination. His friend, the aforementioned Ami Perrin, was an influential member of the Small Council and they

[331] P. Hughes, *The Registers of the Company of Pastors of Geneva in the Time of Calvin* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1966), p. 9.
[332] *Company*, pp. 13-14.

took up Berthelier's petition against his suspension. This caused the ministers publicly to preach from the pulpit that they would not administer the sacrament to Berthelier and that they would all resign if the Council did not revoke its decision. The Council ultimately backtracked, but the Council of two hundred agreed with the Small Council, arguing that the Consistory did not have the authority to suspend someone from the Lord's Supper. The matter was only settled once a new election took place and those in concert with the Consistory, mostly French immigrants, won a slim majority. This helped spur on Perrin's anti-French protest that would eventually lead to his expulsion.[333]

This instance underlines the careful balance that the city required in order for it to work properly. Ultimately, though, the city was controlled by a small number of highly influential Genevans. "Simply put, throughout the life of the Republic, Geneva was governed by an oligarchy: power was concentrated in the Small Council, which ran the day-to-day affairs of government."[334] In the mid-seventeenth century it was customary for the Small Council to meet on the first Sunday of the year and, after hearing a sermon probably given at St Peter's Cathedral by a prominent city preacher, elect new Syndics and members of the council.[335] Throughout the 1650s there was a steady stream of new names added to the Small Council, though there remained a foundation of older Syndics, or "trustees", who were usually reappointed or, at least, re-nominated. The Council of two hundred would present eight names and then through an oral vote the Council would

---

[333] *Ibid*., p. 186.
[334] Watt, *Suicide*, p. 17.
[335] The first words of almost every Small Council Register in the 1650s starts with "Le Conseil General assemble au son de la grosse cloche au Temple de St. Pierre après le sermon de huit (or neuf) heures suivant L'Ordre pour le L'Election des Seigneurs Syndics qui doivent avoir le Gouvernement de L'Etat la presente année apres la priere a Dieu, L'Exhortation faite par Sp. Theodore Tronchin plus ancien Pasteur de cette Eglise…" : AEG, RC 155, f. 1 (7 January 1655). There is one year, 1652, where they met at St Germain instead of St Pierre, though the Registers do not give a reason for this change. Theodore Tronchin preached before every election for seven straight years beginning in 1650.

elect four members who would be that year's four syndics. Prominent families usually had a few members of their family standing for election at the same time. The surnames Gallatin, Pictet, Dupan, Godefroy, and others were usually nominated for years at a time.[336]

These four Syndics and the remaining members of the Small Council presided over most of the other governing bodies of the city and one Syndic served as the presiding member of the Consistory.[337] In addition, as stated above, two of the elders elected each year were meant to come from the Small Council. This gave an even smaller number of people, those whose names were put up for election to the Small Council, considerable influence over the various ecclesial and civic institutions of the canton. While the Consistory had extensive power, the final decision for all punishments was in the hands of the Small Council. During Calvin's time, the great Reformer usually dominated the proceedings of the Consistory, with questions given to and answered by him alone.[338] By the seventeenth century, without Calvin, Beza or any single leader, the various members of the Consistory tended to be more conciliar, though the Syndic, who was a member of the Consistory and a representative of the city councils, usually remained the superintendent. It becomes quite obvious, then, that the control of the city throughout the seventeenth century was centralised around a few prominent families which controlled a vast proportion of civic and ecclesial authority.[339] It also illustrates that there was no one person who had the final decision; there was no prime minister of Geneva who had

---

[336] At the election of 1653 two Gallatins, Isaac and Abraham, were elected as Syndics: AEG, RC 152, f. 1 (2 January 1653).
[337] R. Kingdon, *Adultery and Divorce in Calvin's Geneva* (London, 1995), pp. 13-4.
[338] Sometimes this was due to a dispute between the accused and a member of the Consistory, but usually it was due to Calvin's "forceful personality" and "Formidable skills": *Ibid*., pp. 16-7.
[339] For a list of the Syndics of the Small Council 1650-99, see Appendix below.

primacy over his fellow governors. As we will see when we turn to Turretin's life in the next chapter, the decision to rule by assembly created problems once there was no longer a theological consensus amongst the various oligarchs.

The final institution that will be examined is the Academy and its role in Geneva in the seventeenth century. At the turn of the century, the Academy was matriculating only a fraction of students compared to other universities in Europe, such as the University of Heidelberg.[340] But what was causing this decline in the Academy beginning in the seventeenth century? Maag highlights an important point that roots many of the problems concerning Geneva in the 1600s: the lack of leadership. She writes, "Beza had been the Academy's backbone, and had pioneered the hiring of professors of law and medicine. By 1600, he was in his seventies, and increasingly crippled by deafness, he could no longer really watch over the [Academy] and give to it some of his vision of Geneva as an international centre of learning."[341] In 1616 the Company of Pastors met and recognized the school's need to regain its former renown. The former professor of philosophy, Monsieur De Bons, had died and there was an urgent need to fill his place. The Company deliberated, concluding:

> Et d'autant qu'il est besoing d'avoir un Professeur en Philosophie en la place de feu M. De Bons, Messieurs desirent que la Compagnie jette les yeux sur quelqu'un de dehors, qui soit homme de renom pour bien faire telle profession et donner bruit à cette Ecole.[342]

---

[340] K. Maag, *Seminary or University? The Genevan Academy and Reformed Higher Education, 1560-1620* (Aldershot, 1995), p. 82.
[341] *Ibid*., p. 87.
[342] AEG, RCP 6, f. 112 (26 January 1616).

The Pastors were clearly aware of their waning influence and sought to find a professor worthy of being heard throughout the Reformed and Early Modern world.

The Academy in the seventeenth century shifted, according to Heyd, in two noticeable directions: first, it became primarily an ecclesiastical school and, second, its method became scholastic.[343] Calvin, of course, had always intended the school to be ecclesiastical in nature; that is he desired it to be a school primarily designed to teach right theology.[344] "La tendance de l'Académie de Calvin fut énemment théologique. Le but de son fondateur était de former des ministers érudits, capables de protéger vigoureusement la Réforme."[345] The seminal professors of the Academy were certainly theologically orientated: Beza as professor of theology, Antoine-Raoul Chevalier was professor of Hebrew, and François Bérauld professor of Greek. The faculty quickly expanded, however, as Jean Tagaut was appointed lecturer in the Arts in 1559 and in 1565 the Company appointed professors in Law and Philosophy. The Academy even attempted to institute a course in Medicine, though it appears to have quickly dissolved.[346] The five subjects of Theology, Hebrew, Greek, Law and Philosophy remained steady throughout the sixteenth and into the seventeenth century. In 1632 the Company attempted to add another course, this time mathematics. The Company decided in June 1626 to search for a Bohemian doctor to teach their mathematics course, but six years later they ended up giving the lectureship to one of their own, Jean-Rodolphe Fabri.

---

[343] M. Heyd, *Between Orthodoxy and the Enlightenment: Jean-Robert Chouet and the Introduction of Cartesian Science in the Academy* (London, 1982), p. 15.
[344] Maag rightly stresses that this was not its *only* objective, though, stating: "To the magistrates and a few of Geneva's ministers, the foundation of the Academy offered the opportunity to develop a prestige institution of higher education, on a par with Europe's long-established universities" offering courses in theology, law, and medicine, amongst other disciplines: Maag, *Seminary*, p. 3.
[345] J. Gaberel, *Histoire de l'Église de Genève depuis le Commencement de la Réformation jusqu'en 1815* (3 vols, Geneva, 1853), I p. 338.
[346] Simon Simoni was assigned the lectureship in Medicine in 1565: *Université Genève*, I p. 638.

Originally, Fabri was only a lecturer in mathematics, but the next year he was commissioned as a professor of Greek, alongside his other duties.[347] Fabri died in 1638 and, apparently, the mathematics course died with him. Finally, a professorship of eloquence (Belles-Lettres) was given to Ézéchiel Spanheim (1629-1710) in 1651, an office that would last well into the modern era.[348] These innovations are rare for the Academy during the century after Calvin. Theological studies were foundational to the work of the Academy during this period. In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, the Academy would begin to expand dramatically, adding professorships in oriental languages (1676), Church history (1697), a resuscitated professorship in mathematics (1704), and an honorary professorship in geography (1713).[349] Klauber sums up the condition of the latter half of the seventeenth century well when he writes, "The last twenty-five years of the seventeenth century witnessed the growing secularization of the academy, not only in the discipline and academic performance of the student body, but also because of the growing dominance of Cartesian philosophy."[350]

The seventeenth century saw the juxtaposition of two views on the future of Reformed theology: the codification of an identifiable Reformed Orthodoxy or the continued reformation of theology in a more liberal direction. It is difficult to distinguish adequately between these two positions, as theologians, magistrates, and ministers on both sides would have considered themselves to be evangelical in the truest sense of the word; that is, they would have considered themselves to be the logical continuation of the

---

[347] AEG, RCP 8, ff. 33, 207, 211, 224.
[348] AEG, RCP 9, f. 311.
[349] *Université Genève*, I p. 641.
[350] M. Klauber, *Between Reformed Scholasticism and Pan-Protestantism: Jean-Alphonse Turretin (1671-1737) and Enlightened Orthodoxy at the Academy of Geneva* (London, 1994), p. 37.

theology of the sixteenth-century Reformers. Beginning in the 1630s the primary concern for theologians in Geneva was the innovation of Moses Amyraut and the Academy of Saumur. Long gone were the days when the Academy of Geneva could persuade its sister schools to toe the theological line. Inadvertently, Amyraut initiated a theological debate that would dominate the Academy throughout Turretin's life.

Heyd's second development, the movement into scholasticism, is a difficult one to argue from the historical perspective. The arguments concerning the content of scholastic theology in the Reformed world will be discussed in a later chapter, but it is difficult to understand the historical arguments for a drastic shift in methodology being a problem in the Academy. Put in another way: there is very little evidence that the method of theology in the seventeenth century was a conscious dividing point for Reformed theologians. Theodore Beza was already utilizing scholastic methods in the late sixteenth century and many of his students became prominent Reformed theologians, adopting his preferred method in their works. What became polemical amongst the Reformed were the conclusions of the innovative theology from the Remonstrants, Arminians, Amyrauldians, and coming Cartesians. If the use of rational theology became problematic, it was not evident in the works of the Reformed theologians or in the Registers of the Academy. In the mid-to-late seventeenth century, the theologians, pastors, and magistrates of the Reformed Tradition are not debating method, but theology. The next chapter will show that Turretin's theological life was dominated by arguments concerning the variety of Christian dogmatics in the Early Modern period. By Turretin's time, the Reformation's appeal to *sola scriptura* as the authoritative measure in orthodox theology had produced so many divergent interpretations that territorial disputes

began to erupt. For the French, and indirectly the Swiss, the polemics of the Tridentine Roman Catholic Church caused the French Protestants to find ways to respond. In light of the complaints against certain aspects of Protestant theology, namely double predestination, the Reformed, including Beza, Turretin, and others, tried to find a way to appeal to Catholics without compromising their confession. In doing so, however, they alienated many of their colleagues in Geneva, the Netherlands, and some within the French Empire. This subject will be taken up again in the following chapters.

III. Conclusion

This chapter, then, has established the historical context of seventeenth-century Geneva within Early Modern Europe. Though no longer as influential as it was during the sixteenth century, Geneva remains an important city for Reformed theology and ministry. Geneva was in the midst of an ever-consolidating oligarchy, consisting, primarily, of *bourgeoisie* families with immense influence. Additionally, the Academy of Geneva was concerned with the growing influence of heterodox theology and philosophy. It is in the framework of a tendentious and polemic situation that we find Turretin. Geneva is on the cusp of an important decision: will it remain faithful to the Reformed Tradition, as Turretin views it, or will it succumb to a theology that abrogates the sovereign work of God? We will pick up this question in chapter four, but it now becomes important to construct the biography of Turretin in order to grasp his theology further.

Chapter 3: A Biography of Francis Turretin

Since Turretin's death in 1687, there has been very little written about his life. The first retelling came at his funeral, when Bénédict Pictet (1655-1724) eulogized his uncle on 3 November 1687.[351] Only two monographs have been produced, the first in 1871 and the second in 1900.[352] There is, therefore, a need for an updated biography that takes into account new historiographical trends, archive research, and analysis. One cannot simply discount previous historical work, though. This chapter will attempt to build upon previous scholarship with the goal of providing new and reinterpreted facts about Turretin's life that will be the foundation for succeeding chapters. This scholarship is critical in understanding Turretin's impact upon the Reformed Tradition both during his life and after because it properly situates Turretin's scholarship within his historical milieu and it allows the context to speak for itself. As detailed in the first chapter, much scholarship concerning post-Reformation Reformed history and theology was written within an anachronistic perspective, often placing modern systematic theology definitions upon the Early Modern theological framework or looking for a 'Barthian' characteristic in the work of a reformer.[353]

---

[351] The Oration was first published in the 1688-89 Geneva edition of Turretin's *Institutes* and again in 1696 in what Keizer describes as the third edition of the *Institutes*, this time published in Leiden and Utrecht: G. Keizer, *François Turrettini: Sa Vie et Ses Oeuvres et le Consensus* (Lausanne, 1900), p. 223.

[352] *Vie Turretini* and Keizer, *Turrettini*.

[353] A recent book re-examining the work of John Calvin in light of subsequent theological developments is R. Zachman, *Reconsidering John Calvin* (New York, NY, 2012). Zachman is certainly an accomplished Calvin scholar, yet he consciously reconsiders Calvin's theology in light of theologians outside of both Calvin's time and his tradition. For instance, he contrasts Calvin's views on the study of astronomy with those of Blaise Pascal (1623-62). Pascal was born nearly sixty years after Calvin and operated within the Roman Catholic theological framework. Zachman outlines their two views on the study of astronomy and then forces a comparison that was never historically tenable and in the end it does not move the interpretations of either Calvin or Pascal forward.

Another common problem concerning Early Modern historiography is the bias of the writer, both positively and negatively, towards the subject.[354] This is certainly exemplified in Pictet's funeral oration for his uncle. This is no doubt understandable, as what person, modern or otherwise, would wish to characterize the dead in a negative way during his funeral? Pictet's objective was to portray Turretin as 'the blessed one' who desired that the "talents entrusted to him should only be used for the public."[355] Again, this type of hagiography is not isolated to Pictet's love for his uncle. Larissa Taylor argues that Early Modern funeral sermons and orations were a "highly malleable form that could be adapted for propagandistic uses in times of religious crisis" and that they often provided listeners with "heroes" to emulate and "villains" to fear.[356] Though Pictet does not provoke fear in his listener's ears, he does, however, closely follow the "Renaissance Model"[357] of positive comparison and exhortation. Pictet harkens back to Seneca, Cicero, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Augustine, connecting Turretin with the heroes of Western Civilization. Constructing a nuanced history of Turretin based upon Pictet's oration alone, therefore, would be highly problematic.

In addition to the problems with Pictet's oration, others have exposed the historically shallow work of Eugene de Budé.[358] Martin Klauber mentions Graham Gargett's criticism of Budé and Jean Gaberel, who, Gargett claims, fabricated stories about Jacob

---

[354] Recently this has been exemplified by Armstrong's description of Early Modern scholasticism as 'rigid', in contrast to Early Modern humanism as 'amenable': *Amyraut Heresy*, pp. 41-2.
[355] B. Pictet, "Funeral Oration of Benedict Pictet Concerning the Life and Death of Francis Turretin; Delivered on the Third Day of November of the Year 1687," in *Elenctic Theology*, III p. 665.
[356] L. Taylor, "Funeral Sermons and Orations as Religious Propaganda in Sixteenth-century France," in B. Gordon and P. Marshall (eds), *The Place of the Dead: Death and Remembrance in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 224-39.
[357] *Ibid*., p. 226.
[358] M. Klauber, "Theological Transition in Geneva: From Jean-Alphonse Turretin to Jacob Vernet," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, pp. 256-70.

Vernet (1698-1789) and Voltaire (1694-1778) in order "to make Vernet seem the innocent victim of Voltaire's egregious attacks."[359] This indicates that de Budé's nineteenth-century works on Early Modern Geneva may deal in hagiographic revisionism rather than serious scholarship. While it is irresponsible simply to disregard these works as fabrications, it is important to reconstruct accurately the history of Early Modern Europe in a way that is true to the primary evidence available.[360] This means that previous historical accounts will have to be analysed with a careful attention to what the primary documents demonstrate. Therefore, this chapter will reconstruct Turretin's life based on solid historical footing with the goal of understanding his influence upon Geneva and the Reformed Tradition.

I. La Famiglia Turrettini

Like many Early Modern citizens of the canton of Geneva, the Turrettini[361] family immigrated due to religious turmoil. Turretin's grandfather, Francesco, moved to Geneva in 1592 already wealthy from many years in the silk trade business. In Geneva he continued his financial pursuits, making him an affluent and influential member of the Canton's community.[362] The Turretins were well versed in the Reformation by the time

---

[359] *Ibid*., p. 265 (n.29). Klauber cites G. Gargett, *Jacob Vernet, Geneva and the Philosophes* (Oxford, 1995) and criticizes E. de Budé, *Vie de Jacob Vernet, theologien genevois (1698-1789)* (Lausanne, 1893) and J. Gaberel, *Voltaire et les Genevois* (Paris, 1857).

[360] This point is important as de Budé and Gaberel may not have *knowingly* reproduced a false story. Rather, they may have been using the best evidence and this story was amongst the evidence provided. It would be unnecessarily cynical of the historian to attribute a nefarious intent to what may have been an honest mistake.

[361] The orthography of the name 'Turretin' changes based upon the local language. The Anglicized spelling is 'Turretin', the Latin spelling is 'Turrettinus', and the Italian 'Turrettini'. Because Turretin is from an Italian family living in a French-speaking city and writing in a Latin theological context all three spellings (and more) are frequently used. This work, however, will favour the Anglicized version, Turretin, unless it is more appropriate to use one of the other spellings.

[362] This was not Francesco's first time in Geneva, though. He had lived in Geneva for a short period in the 1570s: J. Dennison, "The Life and Career of Francis Turretin," in *Elenctic Theology*, III pp. 640-1.

Francesco reached Geneva thanks, in large part, to the work of Peter Martyr Vermigli (1499-1562) as Prior of St. Frediano church in Lucca, Italy.[363] Vermigli was schooled in Roman Catholic theology and after considerable study in both theology and Old Testament exegesis, he was appointed Prior of St. Peter ad Aram in Naples.[364] Vermigli's time in Naples, according to Steinmetz, was a 'turning point' where he read the works of contemporary reformers Huldrych Zwingli (1484-1531), Martin Bucer (1491-1551), and Philipp Melanchthon (1497-1560) and conversed with other reform minded Catholics such as Juan de Valdès (1509-1541).[365] Therefore, by the time Vermigli reached Lucca, the home of Francis Turretin's great-grandfather Regolo, he was thoroughly persuaded by the ideas of the Protestant Reformation.

During his time in Lucca, Vermigli stressed the doctrine of justification by grace alone through the salvific work of Jesus Christ. Dennison writes that Vermigli "expounded Paul's letters to large crowds" every day of the week and Rome soon took notice.[366] Vermigli was forced to flee in 1542 when the reassembled Inquisition was sent to investigate the spread of heresy in Lucca.[367] Regolo Turretin remained in Lucca, but the work of Vermigli served its purpose and Regolo's son, Francesco, was wholly convinced of the tenets of the new 'evangelical' faith.[368] By the age of seventeen,

---

[363] The seminal twentieth-century work on Vermigli is P. McNair, *Peter Martyr in Italy: An Anatomy of Apostasy* (Oxford, 1967). McNair's work helped revive Vermigli scholarship: J. Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace* (Leiden, 1976) and F. James, "Peter Martyr Vermigli: At the Crossroads of Late Medieval Scholasticism, Christian Humanism and Resurgent Augustinianism," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, pp. 62-78.

[364] Vermigli studied under a Jewish doctor during his time in Bologna: D. Steinmetz, *Reformers in the Wings: From Geiler von Kaysersberg to Theodore Beza* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 106-7.

[365] *Ibid*., p. 107.

[366] Dennison, "Life and Career," p. 639.

[367] A somewhat ironic event as Vermigli took the name of the thirteenth century St. Peter Martyr of Verona who was a ruthless inquisitor and was eventually killed by the heretics he 'persecuted': McNair, *Peter Martyr*, p. 51.

[368] The term 'evangelical' was an early designation given to those Christians who professed the main tenets of the Protestant Reformation: *sola fide*, *sola gratia*, *sola scriptura*, *solus Christus*, and *soli Deo Gloria*.

Francesco was running his father's silk business, but it became apparent soon after that he would need to leave his hometown. Keizer writes, "Nous ne savons pas de source certain de quelle façon il se familiarisa avec l'Evangile, mais il est constant que, âgé de vingt-sept ans, il crut prudent de fuir sa ville natale: il était mal vu, parce qu'il avait osé se prononcer ouvertement sur l'Evanglie dans un esprit hostile à Rome."[369] Dennison claims that a few years earlier, aged nineteen, Francesco "became convinced of evangelical truth, content with the 'seul Mérite de J. C. pour mon salut.'"[370] Regardless of the age or reason, Francesco fled and spent considerable time in various European cities before settling in Geneva. He married Michele Burlamachi Camille in Zurich in 1587 and soon had two children: Benedict (1588-1631) and Claire (b. 1591).[371]

Benedict Turretin had a prosperous career in Geneva as both a theologian and a minister. Due to his father's successful silk business, the Turretin family gained considerable influence in Geneva. Francesco was appointed to the Council of Two-Hundred and the Council of Sixty and for some time was the city banker.[372] Benedict was trained at Calvin's Academy and graduated at the age of fourteen, but chose to continue his classical and theological studies until the age of twenty-one under the tutelage of Théodore de Bèze (1519-1605), Antoine de la Faye (1540-1615) and Jean Diodati (1576-1649).[373] Here Keizer states that Francesco often took his son on trips through Europe in order for him to learn foreign languages and he became acquainted

---

[369] Keizer, *Turrettini*, p. 28.
[370] Dennison, "Life and Career," p. 640. He quotes Francesco from "Mémorial de la Vie de Mr François Turrettini, tire de son proprie journal," AEG, Archives Turrettini, Fonds 2B3.
[371] Keizer, *Turrettini*, p. 34. Dennison notes that Claire died eleven days after being born: Dennison, "Life and Career," p. 652 (n. 28).
[372] Dennison, "Life and Work," p. 541.
[373] Keizer, *Turrettini*, p. 36.

with professors and pastors in Zurich, Heidelberg and Frankfurt.[374] Soon Benedict became the professor of theology at the Academy in Geneva and an influential member of the Reformed ministry in Geneva and beyond.

Arminianism was on the rise in Early Modern Europe and in 1618 the Synod of Dort was convened. Benedict was not sent as a delegate to the conference, but he co-signed a letter to the Synod in full support of the Reformed position against the Remonstrants.[375] Benedict, however, was a delegate at the next Synod convened by the French, in the town of Alès in 1620, where the French Reformed Church condemned the theology of Arminius and accepted the Canons of Dort.[376] Benedict proposed that the council "seek out some expedient to prevent the errors, which has disturbed the Churches of the Low-Countries, from creeping into the French churches."[377] The tensions within the Protestant church in France no doubt spurred on Turretin's desire to unite under a single, visible decree. The members of the Synod swore an oath that repudiated not only the Arminians, but also 'Popery' and the infiltration of Pelagianism[378] into the 'Church of God.'[379] After

---

[374] *Ibid*.

[375] The Remonstrants were 'liberal' Christians in the Netherlands who were influenced by the writings of Jacob Arminius (1560-1609), professor of theology at Leiden. Arguably the most influential Remonstrant of the early seventeenth century was Simon Episcopus (1583-1643): G. Voogt, "Remonstrant-Counter-Remonstrant Debates: Crafting a Principled Defense of Toleration After the Synod of Dortrecht (1619-1650)," *Church History and Religious Culture*, 89 (2009), pp. 489-524.

[376] Dennison, "Life and Career," p. 641. This was somewhat of a 'calm before the storm' fix. In twenty years' time Moses Ayraut would publish his *Apologie* promoting 'hypothetical universalism' and by 1685 many French Huguenots were either persuaded by Amyraut's theology or tolerated it in order to preserve Protestant unity: É. Labrousse, "Calvinism in France, 1598-1685", in *International Calvinism*, p. 302.

[377] G. Brandt, *An Abridgement of Gerard Brandt's History of the Reformation in the Low-Countries: Containing All that is Curious in that Most Valuable Work* (London, 1725), p. 626.

[378] Pelagius was a fifth-century Christian philosopher who rejected predestination and original sin, instead proposing that God's grace frees the believer from sin, enabling him to do good works through his free will. He was vigorously opposed by St Augustine and St Jerome, who argued that good works were only possible because God's grace works in the believer. Augustine and Jerome were victorious and Pelagius was declared a heretic in 418: art. on Pelagius by G. Bonner in *ODNB*.

[379] The oath states, in part: "I declare also and I protest that I reject and condemn the Doctrine of the Arminians, because it makes God's Decree of Election to depend upon the mutable Will of Man, and for that it doth extenuate and make null and void the Grace of God; it exalteth Man, and the powers of Free Will to his destruction, it reduceth into the Church of God old, ejected Pelagianism, and is a Mask and

his time in France, Benedict returned to Geneva as Professor of theology and Rector of the Academy.

His most important civic accomplishment was securing funds for the rebuilding of Genevan city defences. In 1602 the Duke of Savoy dispatched his army to attack the city of Geneva by surprise. The Duke's troops attempted to scale the walls, but were unsuccessful. The city guard and militia were able to respond in time to thwart the attack and many Savoyard soldiers were hanged for being thieves since there was technically a peace treaty between Geneva and Savoy at the time and openly identifying the culprits as Savoyard troops may have induced a war. In the 1620s as the walls of Geneva were deteriorating, the Duke of Savoy was, again, threatening and the city coffers dwindling, the Venerable Company decided to send Benedict as a city representative to the Netherlands in order to secure funds for renovations. Gautier writes, "Les Provinces Unies de Pais-Bas ayant marqué en diverses occasions, prendre beaucoup de part à ce qui regardoit cette Ville, on crut que affectionnées comme 124lls l'etoient, a la Religion Protestante, et 124lls124es des dangers auxquels Geneve se voyoit exposée, 124lls ne lui refuseraient pas quelque secours."[380] Benedict delivered letters on behalf of Geneva to the members of the Etats Generaux and the Prince of Orange and was successful. He received 30,000 livres and 10,000 livres per month for three months if the Duke besieged the city. In addition, the churches of Hamburg, Emden and Bremen gave two 2,500 ecús

---

Vizard for Popery to creep in among us under that disguise, and subverteth all Assurance of Everlasting Life and Happyness": F. P. van Stam, *The Controversy Over the Theology of Saumur, 1635-1650: Disrupting Debates Among the Huguenots in Complicated Circumstances* (Amsterdam and Maarssen, 1988), p. 18, (n. 50).

[380] *Histoire Genève*, I, pp. 485-6 (n. "k").

and the Prince of Orange loaned the city the engineer du Mottet.[381] These funds helped secure Geneva for forty years.

Though Benedict was an influential member of the Geneva community, he was overshadowed by the impact of his son, Francis, and grandson, Jean-Alphonse. Benedict's tenure in Geneva was relatively tranquil. There were a few moments of theological conflict, most notably his rebuttal to the Roman Catholic polemicist Pierre Cotton on the authority of the Bible and the Company of Pastor's 1588 French translation[382], but, in general, Benedict's accomplishments were dominated by his more famous colleagues: Theodore Tronchin, Jean Diodati, and Antoine de La Faye. In 1631 he died at an early age due to severe fever; his son Francis was only eight years old.[383]

This, then, has laid the groundwork for understanding Turretin's life. Some initial conclusions show that Turretin was born into a wealthy and influential family from an important city in both Reformed and Early Modern European history.[384] This is important because it gave Turretin opportunities in education, travel, and access to prominent theological figures of his time. In addition, as shown in the previous chapter,

---

[381] *Ibid*.

[382] Armstrong calls this edition an 'embarrassment' for the Company of Pastors and claims that the 1588 edition was nothing more than propaganda in favour of the theological conclusions of the Reformed church. In a somewhat contradictory concession, Armstrong states in a footnote (p. 129 [n. 55]) that the OT translation was 'solid exegetical work from an impressive (for the time) list of original manuscripts.' His main claim that the 1588 is a distortion is based upon the changes in French between this edition and Olivetan's 1535 French edition, not on whether the translation is true to the manuscripts: B. Armstrong, "Geneva and the Theology and Politics of French Calvinism: The Embarrassment of the 1588 Edition of the Bible of the Pastors and Professors of Geneva," in W. Neuser (ed.), *Calvinus Ecclesiae Genevensis Custos* (Frankfurt, 1982), pp. 113-33.

[383] Dennison, "Life and Career," p. 642. William McComish argues that Benedict was actually 'the best systematic theologian' of his time, but due to his untimely death his legacy was cut short: W. McComish, *The Epigones* (Allison Park, 1989), p. 37. Benedict's father, Francesco, only died three years earlier at the age of 81: F. Turrettini, *Notice Biographique sur Bénédict Turrettini, Théologien Genevois du XVIIe Siècle* (Genève, 1871), p. 292.

[384] Saint-Germain in Paris was known as "Little Geneva" due to its high Huguenot population. This highlights Geneva's intrinsic connection to Protestantism in the Early Modern ethos: M. Prestwich, "Calvinism in France, 1555-1629," in *International Calvinism*, pp. 102-3.

the wealthy families of Geneva were often called upon to govern the city. Therefore, Turretin and his various family members were in a privileged position as affluent, native Genevans. Turretin was born into a thoroughly Protestant family that had fled Italy, settled in the Protestant Rome, and helped lead the Reformed Church; like the Calvin or Tronchin families of earlier years, the Turretins were becoming members of the cultural and theological elite of Geneva. Soon Turretin would attempt to guide the Reformed Church towards 'High Orthodoxy' and his son, Jean-Alphonse, would lead the same church towards toleration.[385]

II. Francis Turretin: A Polemical Life

(i) Early Years

As with most prominent historical figures, Turretin's earliest years are mostly unknown. Turretin was not the first child of Benedict and his wife, Louise Micheli, nor was he the first of their children to be called 'Francis.' Born 17 October 1623 in Geneva, Turretin was the fourth of seven children[386] and his immediate older brother was also named Francis.[387] The first Francis, however, died at a young age and his name was passed on to his younger brother. Pictet remarks that from the beginning of his life

---

[385] The historic dwelling of the Turretin family still remains in the old city of Geneva. It is adjacent to St Peter's Cathedral, the Catholic church that became Protestant after the conversion of the Canton in the early sixteenth century. Members of the Turretin family still reside in the *Maison Turrettini*.

[386] His older siblings were sister Barbe (b. 1617), who married André Pictet and bore Benedict Pictet; brother Etienne (1619-1696); and brother Francis (1622-before 1623). His younger siblings: sister Marie (1626-1696); brother Horace (b. 1629); and the youngest being Bénédict (1631-1707): J.A. Galiffe, *Notices Généalogiques sur les Familles Genevoises, Depuis les Premiers Temps jusqu'a nos Jours* (7 vols, Genève, 1831), II pp. 337-8. Galiffe omits the first Francis for unknown reasons.

[387] The first Francis was baptized at the Italian church on 13 January 1622: RCP, EC Rép. 1.4, f. 312r. At the time of our Francis's death, both of his sisters and two of his brothers were still alive.

Turretin "held the center." Not only was he the middle of seven children, but, according to Pictet, his father Benedict, while "near death," called Francis to his deathbed and professed, "This one has been sealed with the seal of God."[388] It is difficult to say whether this is a fabrication of Pictet meant to honour the recently deceased Turretin or a true statement Benedict made to his son. Keizer and Dennison cite it as authentic, though, again, it is difficult to ascertain its authenticity independently from Pictet as later historians cite this as the sole evidence.[389]

Other than this one quotation highlighting Turretin's primacy over his siblings, there is almost no evidence of what transpired during Turretin's childhood. What the historian can assume, though, is what was broadly general for all Genevan citizens. Turretin, like all of his siblings, was baptized at the Italian Church on 23 October 1623, six days after birth.[390] Benedict was serving as Chair of Theology at the Academy and Keizer states that Mrs Turretin, Louise, held significant influence over her son, so much so that when Turretin was in his prime as a pastor in Geneva the French congregation in Lyons wrote to her and sent two ambassadors to convince her to persuade Turretin to take up the post at the French church there.[391] While Benedict died when Turretin was still a child, Louise did not die until 1676, only eleven years before Francis. She was, therefore, present for a majority of Turretin's life and would have been a particularly persuasive and

---

[388] Pictet, "Funeral Oration," p. 662.
[389] Dennison's citation is Pictet's funeral oration, but Keizer does not give any indication where he found this quotation. Keizer's quotation is "Hic sigillo Dei obsignatus est": Dennison, "Life and Career," 642; Keizer, *François Turrettini*, p. 56. This is most likely a story that began with de Budé's biography. De Budé concludes the story by remarking pithily "Ces paroles n'étaient-elles pas prophétiques?": *Vie Turretini*, p. 27.
[390] RCP, EC Rép. 1.4, f. 312r.
[391] Keizer, *Turrettini*, p. 56.

authoritative person on Turretin's development. In addition, we know that Benedict was given bourgeois status in 1627, granting his children the same status from birth.[392]

Turretin's early education came from the 'petite école' of Geneva.[393] Naphy has shown quite persuasively that the education system of Geneva mirrored that of the surrounding French territories. "Students were divided into six grades with teachers specializing for each level. Young students were enrolled to begin their education under *l'abécédaire*, who taught rudimentary reading and writing."[394] Ultimately these schools were meant to produce, according to Naphy, *gens de bien*: good citizens.[395] These schools remained mostly intact after the consolidation of Geneva under Calvin; Turretin, as a member of the *bourgeois*, or citizen, would have been able to partake free of charge.[396] Pictet remarks that in Turretin's earliest years he "produced tokens of his genius" and "a prediction was easy from these starting places to the summits he would attain."[397] It is clear that, then, Turretin would have received a basic education in Geneva before moving on to his higher education studies at the Academy.

It becomes fairly difficult, then, to come to any solid conclusions about Turretin's early years. Most of what is argued for here is from accounts of Genevan schooling in general. His father was in the midst of a promising career as a theologian and professor at the Academy and had he not died at such a young age Benedict surely would have

---

[392] Turrettini, *Notice*, p. 290.
[393] Keizer, *Turrettini*, p. 56.
[394] W. Naphy, "The Reformation and the Evolution of Geneva's Schools," in B. Kümin (ed.), *Reformations Old and New: Essays on the Socio-Economic Impact of Religious Change c.1470-1630* (Aldershot, 1996), pp. 185-202.
[395] *Ibid*., p. 188.
[396] Foreigners would have been charged a heavy fee in order to pay for the faculty and administration of the schools: *Ibid*., p. 187. According to R.A. Houston, Turretin inherited some hereditary advantages to education: high wealth, masculinity and Protestantism had a positive correlation in terms of literacy in Early Modern Europe: R.A. Houston, *Literacy in Early Modern Europe* (Harlow, 2002), pp. 141-71.
[397] Pictet, "Funeral Oration," p. 662.

exerted significant influence on Turretin's intellectual life. As it happens, Benedict died at the age of forty-three when Turretin was still very young. Turretin, therefore, would have had to look elsewhere for theological guidance and this naturally leads us to wonder to whom he looked as mentor and teacher. Why did Turretin eventually choose Reformed Orthodoxy during a time of increasing theological variety? In order to answer these questions, we will need to examine his life as a student and understand his intellectual path before he became a theologian in his own right.

(ii) Turretin's Formative Years

Like his father before him, Turretin was trained at Calvin's famous Academy. The Academy had developed considerably since the time of Calvin, though. Started during the twilight of Calvin's life and ministry in Geneva, the Academy's first rector was Calvin's self-appointed successor, Theodore Beza.[398] Beza would outlive Calvin by forty years and "L'histoire des destinées de l'Academie, jusqu'au commencement d'un siècle nouveau, est inseparable du nom de Bèze."[399] In the historiography of the Reformed Tradition, Beza has been a controversial and often divisive figure. As seen in the previous chapter, many twentieth-century historians have portrayed Beza as a distorter of

[398] David Steinmetz disagrees with this claim, writing that "In the first place, Beza's rise to prominence in the French Reformed movement was so rapid that he must be regarded as Calvin's coworker and contemporary and not merely successor." Beza was certainly a renowned theologian in his own right, but being Calvin's successor does not preclude him from simultaneously being a 'coworker' and 'contemporary.' In this instance, it simply reflects the historical evidence of a very real progression of authority at the Academy from Calvin to Beza: Steinmetz, *Reformers*, p. 114. Beza was born in 1519 in Burgundy, France. Like Calvin, he studied law in Orléans and eventually went on to practise in Paris. He eventually became an evangelical and fled to Geneva where he became an influential member of the Reformed community. He died in 1605 of old age. Keizer notes that Benedict Turretin had some training under Beza, but his declining health made Beza's direct impact upon Benedict minuscule: Keizer, *Turrettini*, p. 36. Steinmetz argues that Beza's death "marked the end of an epoch in the history of Europe" in which reformation was giving way to orthodoxy: Steinmetz, *Reformers*, p. 120.

[399] *Université Genève*, I pp. 87-8.

Calvin's original intent, especially as it relates to the doctrine of predestination. However, the evidence points to a much more nuanced conclusion regarding Beza's influence upon the Academy and the Reformed Tradition in general. Regardless, the Academy Turretin experienced was shaped by both Calvin as founder and Beza as first rector.

Turretin entered the Academy in 1637 at a pivotal point in the history of Protestantism.[400] Four years before he was born, the Synod of Dort condemned the writings of Jacob Arminius (1560-1609) and defined, to a degree, Reformed orthodoxy. Turretin's professors were important figures in the drafting of the Canons of Dort[401], especially Jean Diodati[402] and Theodore Tronchin.[403] In addition to Diodate and Tronchin, the professorship at the Academy during Turretin's tenure included David Le Clerc (1591-1654)[404], Jacques Godefrey (1587-1652)[405], Jean Du Pan (1608-84)[406], Frédéric Spanheim (1600-49)[407], and Alexandre Morus (1616-70).[408] This company of theologians, excluding Morus, made up a bastion of 'orthodoxy' at the Academy. Morus,

---

[400] C. le Fort, *Le Livre du Recteur, 1559-1859: Catalogue des Étudiants de l'Académie de Genève de 1559 à 1859* (Geneva, 1860), p. 110.
[401] For the specific contributions of the Genevan delegation, see McComish, *Epigones*, pp. 45-113.
[402] Diodati's family, like Turretin's, were Italian immigrants to Geneva in the mid-sixteenth century. Jean (or Giovanni, his Italian rendering) was educated at the Academy in Geneva and appointed professor of Hebrew in 1597 and professor of theology in 1599. In addition, he served as rector of the academy 1608-10 and 1618-20: *Université Genève*, I pp. 636, 639. There was a considerable influx of Lucchese immigrants in the later part of the sixteenth century, including the Diodatis, Turrettinis, Burlamachis and Calandrinis: O. P. Grell, *Brethren in Christ: A Calvinist Network in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge, 2011), p. 250.
[403] Tronchin was born in Geneva in 1582 and, like Diodati, served as Professor of Hebrew 1606-18, then Professor of Theology from 1615-1656. Additionally, he was Diodati's successor as rector of the Academy 1610-15: *Université Genève*, I pp. 636, 639; McComish, *Epigones*, p. 32.
[404] Professor of Hebrew 1619-54.
[405] Professor of law 1619-52.
[406] Professor of philosophy 1631-50.
[407] Professor of philosophy 1626-31 and theology 1631-42.
[408] Professor of Greek 1639-42 and theology 1642-49. For all dates, see *Université Genève*, I pp. 639-40.

however, was one of the first to introduce Amyrauldianism to the Genevan company, an issue that will be addressed later in the chapter.[409]

Turretin's theological influences, therefore, would have been primarily 'high orthodox' Reformed theologians. Pictet gives considerable credit to Diodati, Tronchin, and Spanheim in Turretin's theological schooling, writing: "Having successfully completed his philosophical course, he surrendered himself wholly to theology. As preceptors, he had the greatest and most celebrated men in all the world."[410] Pictet laments that Spanheim died so early as he was a "European wonder and glory of the beloved one in the heavenly seats."[411] Spanheim had left Geneva under dubious circumstances and it was rumoured that he was jealous of Morus's superior oratorical skills.[412] Pierre Bayle (1647-1706) published a quotation from Spanheim's colleague in Leiden, Claudius Salmasius (1588-1653), in which he wrote that Spanheim had been killed and "Morus avait été le poignard."[413] Morus, then, as the sole Amyrauldian came to Geneva towards the end of Turretin's formal education and would not have had the same impact as the others. Pictet mentions Morus positively in his funeral oration and notes that Turretin produced a series of disputations, *Dei Necessaria Dei Gratia* (1640), against Morus.[414] Ultimately, though, Pictet credits Turretin's intellectual abilities more than his professors for his future accomplishments.[415]

---

[409] Ch. 3, pp. 135-7.
[410] Pictet, "Funeral Oration," p. 663.
[411] *Ibid*.
[412] Borgeaud writes that, "On a dit autrefois, et Senebier a propagé ce soupçon, que Frédéric Spanheim quitta Genève parce qu'il avait conçu quelque jalousie des talents et de l'éloquence d'un jeune homme qui venait d'être appelé à lui succéder, Alexandre Morus": *Université Genève*, I p. 353.
[413] Keizer, *François Turrettini*, p. 59; P. Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique* (16 vols, Paris, 1820), XIII p. 405. Apparently, Spanheim and Salmasius were on less than friendly terms and opposed each other over the attempt to appoint Morus at the Academy in Leiden: Van Stam, *Controversy*, pp. 352-3, 445-6.
[414] H. Heyer, *Catalogue des Thèses de Théologie Soutenues a l'Académie de Genève* (Geneva, 1898), p. 52.
[415] Pictet, "Funeral Oration," p. 664.

In 1642 Turretin began corresponding with Antoine Leger (1596-1661), future professor in theology (1645-61) and rector (1657-59) of the Geneva Academy. Concurrently, Diodati was finishing his controversial French translation of the Bible.[416] Leger wrote to Turretin concerning, amongst other things, the forthcoming translation. He was nervous about Turretin's travels knowing that there were deep divisions within the Reformed community throughout Europe. Yet he stressed that Turretin should treat these men with charity, acknowledging that "intimate friendship enjoys hours of constant strain."[417] Leger also immediately warned Turretin about the novel theology being produced by those of 'Socinian' leaning amongst the Reformed churches.[418] In 1644 he wrote to Turretin in Leiden urging him to be on guard against heterodoxy and to stick close to the teachers of the Leiden Academy "ubi eruditionis ac sapientia lumina fulgent."[419] Clearly Leger believed that there was a very real threat that Turretin would return to Geneva as an Amyrauldian or worse and he took it upon himself to continue to influence Turretin towards Reformed orthodoxy.

Turretin finished his studies in 1644 and soon began a multicultural excursion across the various Protestant academies of Europe, beginning at the academy in Leiden. During this period, Spanheim was in the process of publishing his *Disputatio theologica de gratia universali*.[420] It was normative in Early Modern Europe for students to spend time at the other Academies of Europe after they had completed their studies. In addition to

---

[416] See McComish, *Epigones*, pp. 175-84 for a thorough historical analysis.
[417] BPU, MS Lullin 54, f. 102, p. 1.
[418] *Ibid*., f. 103, p. 1. This illustrates that many who considered themselves orthodox saw Amyrauldianism as nothing short of Socinian and, therefore, heretical.
[419] *Ibid*.
[420] F. Spanheim, *Disputatio theologica de gratia universali* (Leiden, 1644). This work was in direct response to Amyraut's acquittal at the Synod of Alençon. See D. Grohman, "The Genevan Reactions to the Saumur Doctrine of Hypothetical Universalism: 1635-1685," Knox College Ph.D. Thesis (1971), p. 16.

Academies in the Netherlands, it was common for students to go to Switzerland, France, Germany, and England, indicating the relatively connected network of Protestant academies in the Early Modern period.[421] Turretin chose Leiden first because it was where Spanheim had gone after his tenure in Geneva came to end and second, "parce que l'Université de Leyde passait, et cela dura pendant tout le dix-septième siècle, pour la plus célèbre école des réformés."[422] While studying under Spanheim, Turretin was able to defend his thesis: *De verbo Dei scripto in specie et eius origine*.[423] Turretin also pursued various theologians while in Leiden, though. He spent time studying under André Rivet (1572-1651)[424], an orthodox Reformed theologian, John Polyander (1568-1646), who is described as an "orthodox, but conciliatory Calvinist,"[425] and the aforementioned Claudius Salmasius. Leiden had long been a 'liberal' Academy amongst its Reformed peers and Turretin had to make a choice between the high orthodoxy of Spanheim and the 'liberalism' that was developing throughout Early Modern Europe.[426]

In addition, in another letter dated 8 September 1644 Leger informs Turretin of a forthcoming work by John Henry Heidegger (1630-1698) against the Catholic polemicist Jean Morin (1591-1659).[427] Morin was a convert to Catholicism from the Protestantism

---

[421] For a wider discussion on various Protestant communities and the benevolence of some wealthy Protestants see Grell, *Brethren*, pp. 274-99.
[422] Keizer, *François Turrettini*, p. 65.
[423] *Ibid*., p. 66. Keizer notes that this particular work could not be found in the Leiden library on its own, but it was published in Spanheim's *Disputationum Theologicarum Syntagma* (Geneva, 1652). Leger congratulated Turretin on his thesis in a letter written to Turretin in Leiden in December 1644: BPU, MS Lullin 54, f. 106, p. 1.
[424] Rivet wrote a considerable number of letters to France concerning the Amyraut Controversy. He appears to have been a man of dubious character and not particularly well regarded in France: Van Stam, *Controversy*, pp. 439-42.
[425] P. Grell, "The Attraction of Leiden University for English Students of Medicine and Theology, 1590-1642," in R. Todd and C. Barfoot (eds), *The Great Emporium: The Low Countries as a Cultural Crossroads in the Renaissance and the Eighteenth Century* (Amsterdam, 1992), pp. 83-104.
[426] Grell, "Attraction of Leiden," p. 85-91.
[427] Heidegger was a Professor at the Academy and Zurich and would eventually write the Helvetic Formula Consensus with Turretin: BPU, MS Lullin 54, f. 104, p. 1.

of his parents and he vigorously refuted various Protestant doctrines including the antiquity of Hebrew vowel points. Leger's writings illuminate the multitude of issues the Protestant churches in Switzerland combated. It was not simply divisions within the Reformed Church that engrossed the Protestant theologians of the seventeenth century, but the continued threat of the Roman Catholic Church. Turretin's future residence in Catholic France no doubt occupied Leger's mind and how this time would impact the young theologian.

After his time in Leiden, Turretin made a quick sojourn in Utrecht. Here he met with Gisbert Voetius (1589-1676) and Johannes Hoornbeek (1617-1666).[428] Voetius had recently fought against the teaching of Cartesian philosophy at the Utrecht academy, favouring the Aristotelian philosophy utilized by scholastics beginning in the late Middle Ages.[429] Turretin also sought out Anna Marie von Schurman, the "tenth muse", and close friend of both Voetius and Descartes.[430] Turretin's time away from Geneva, therefore, was more than simply an opportunity to study; it was an occasion to learn, to meditate, and to seek the wisdom of the famous theologians the continent had to offer.[431] Turretin sought knowledge and his time in the Netherlands provided it abundantly.

---

[428] De Budé claims that Turretin went next to Antwerp, but Voetius and Hoornbeek were both in Utrecht at the time.

[429] In a letter to Father Dinet, Descartes argues that Voetius's complaint was three-fold: 1) Cartesianism is 'opposed to the traditional philosophy (Aristotelianism)'; 2) Learning Cartesianism will inhibit the student's ability to understand Aristotelian terms and definitions; and 3) This new philosophy led to unorthodox conclusions, something Descartes refers to as 'vicious and false'; R. Descartes, "Letter to Father Dinet," in *idem*, *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes* (2 vols, trans. J. Cottingham, *et al*., Cambridge, 1984), II pp. 393-4.

[430] Pictet, "Funeral Oration," p. 664; *Vie Turretini*, pp. 29-30; Keizer, *François Turrettini*, p. 67. Voetius was the person who approved Schurman as a student at Utrecht. For this and Schurman's precarious relationships with Voetius and Descartes, see P. Van Beek, *The First Female University Student: Anna Maria van Schurman (1636)* (Utrecht, 2007), pp. 66-9.

[431] "Quand il ne pouvait les entendre ni s'entretenir avec eux, il préférait se livrer à la lecture ou méditer dans la solitude": *Vie Turretini*, p. 29.

Following his stint in the Netherlands, Turretin next went to France, beginning in Paris. It is necessary now to step away from Turretin's journey in order to recognize adequately a major issue surrounding the French Church in general and the Reformed Tradition in particular: Amyrauldianism. The explanation that follows is very broad as it is not possible in this study to do an in-depth analysis of Amyrauldianism and the various Reformed reactions. It is more pertinent simply to understand the situation broadly and assess Turretin's role in curtailing it.[432] For Protestants in France, the seventeenth century was a tumultuous period. France remained a highly Catholic nation after the Reformation and the rights of French Huguenots[433] were insecure for most of the century and revoked altogether after the Edict of Nantes was discontinued in 1685. It was important for the Reformed Church in France to stay united in opposition to the prevailing power of the French King and the inner workings of a Catholic hierarchy.[434] The previously mentioned Synod of Alès was meant to stem the tide of dissention within the French Reformed church, but the problems were just beginning.

After the Synod of Dort in 1618-19, the Reformed church was consciously pre-deterministic over and against the 'liberal' Arminianism which tended to stress free will. In 1634 Amyraut wrote the *Brief Traitté de la Prédestination et de ses Principales Dépendances* as a response to Roman Catholics who claimed double predestination made

---

[432] For a full picture of the controversy and the reactions surrounding it, see *Amyraut Heresy*, and Van Stam, *Controversy*.
[433] This term refers to Protestants who hold French citizenship.
[434] During this time the infamous Roman Catholics Cardinal Richelieu and Cardinal Mazarin were highly influential upon the already decidedly Catholic King Louis XIII: Van Stam, *Controversy*, p. 1. Louis XIII was not a tyrannical king towards Protestants, nor was he unable to forgive them if warranted, but his desire for France to remain Catholic was for both religious and political purposes: a united Church helped solidify a united France: V. Tapié, *France in the Age of Louis XIII and Richelieu* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 119-20.

God seem unjust and prejudicial. Roger Nicole adequately sums up Amyraut's central thesis:

> 1. Sin is a result of the darkening of the understanding.
> 2. God, moved by an earnest desire to save all mankind, decided to give in ransom His Son Jesus Christ, who died 'equally for all men', and to make a universal offer of salvation to all men.
> 3. This offer is made sometimes more clearly, as when the gospel is preached; sometimes more obscurely, as in the case of the witness of nature to the heathen unreached by the gospel. Nevertheless, God has predestined all men and every man unto salvation, provided they believe; and in nature there is sufficient presentation of the truth so that men may exercise faith if they only will do so.
> 4. Although man is not precluded from believing by any external constraint, his corruption has rendered him morally unable to accept God's offer. It is therefore necessary that God Himself should produce faith in the hearts of those whom He has chosen to redeem.
> 5. This he does only for the elect, by a supernatural enlightenment of mind or by sweet moral suasion, which leaves intact the operation of the will.[435]

There is a nuanced difference between Amyraut and the conclusions of the Synod of Dort, primarily in regards to the universality of Christ's death on the cross. Point 2, Article 8 of the Canons of Dort reads:

> For it was the entirely free plan and very gracious will and intention of God the Father that the enlivening and saving effectiveness of his Son's costly death should work itself out in all his chosen ones, in order that he might grant justifying faith to them only and thereby lead them without fail to salvation. In other words, it was God's will that Christ through the blood of the cross (by which he confirmed the new covenant) should effectively redeem from every people, tribe, nation, and language all those and only those who were chosen from eternity to salvation and given to him by the Father; that he should grant them faith (which, like the Holy Spirit's other saving gifts, he acquired for them by his death); that he should cleanse them by his blood from all their sins, both original and

[435] R. Nicole, *Moyse Amyraut: A Bibliography* (New York, NY, and London, 1981), pp. 9-10.

> actual, whether committed before or after their coming to faith; that he should faithfully preserve them to the very end; and that he should finally present them to himself, a glorious people, without spot or wrinkle.[436]

The Canons had, then, limited Christ's salvific work on the cross to the eternal elect *only*. While Amyraut's theology maintained salvation solely for the elect, it expanded Christ's salvific work to all people. Amyraut's theology came to be known as 'hypothetical universalism.'[437]

The Reformed Church set out to settle the matter quickly. The response from the various Reformed centres of Europe illustrates the continued divisions developing. Guillaume Rivet sent his brother André at The Hague a letter concerning what he heard at Saumur. For Guillaume, there was only one logical conclusion to Amyraut's theology: Arminianism.[438] They moved swiftly to resolve the situation and called another French Nation Synod, this time in Alençon in 1637. After allowing Amyraut and his comrade Paul Testard (1599-1650) to defend their theses, the Synod dismissed them with a simple censure, prohibiting them to produce works that spoke of "conditional decrees" or the idea that "Christ died for all," amongst other "unorthodox" statements.[439] Ultimately, this decision muddied the waters. Had the Synod denounced Amyrauldianism altogether

---

[436] Found at http://www.crcna.org/welcome/beliefs/confessions/canons-dort; accessed 03/09/2014.
[437] Crisp offers a succinct definition of Hypothetical Universalism: "Christ offers himself for all humanity with the respect to the sufficiency of his work but for the elect alone with regard to its efficacy, because he brought about salvation only for the predestined." O. Crisp, *Deviant Calvinism: Broadening Reformed Theology* (Minneapolis, MN, 2014), p. 177.
[438] "à vie pour ceux esquels la vie ne fust point, et que l'Apostre n'a jamais ainsi entendu ou usurpé ce terme, aussi ne scauroye je comment m'arrester en ce chemin de l'Arminianisme si j'en estois venu justques là…": Leiden UB, BPL 287.I, f. 101. I am citing an edited version found in Van Stam, *Controversy*, p. 455. For a discussion on Arminianism, see Ch. 1, pp. 17-21. Rivet's use of the term 'Arminian' is as a pejorative. Anything less than strict limited atonement was considered by many in the Reformed community to be heresy.
[439] Nicole, *Moyse*, p. 10-11.

they may have stemmed the theological tide.[440] However, Amyrauldianism continued to be a major factor in Protestant polemics during the seventeenth century.

When Turretin came to Paris in 1645 he stayed in the house of Jean Daillé (1594-1670) a known supporter of Amyraut. Daillé did not believe that those against Amyraut—the Rivets, Pierre du Moulin (1568-1658), and Spanheim—gave him fair treatment.[441] By all accounts, Daillé and Turretin were good friends and they continued to correspond throughout the rest of Daillé's life.[442] For the remainder of Turretin's French studies he was inundated with Amyrauldian sympathisers. In Paris, he learned under Daillé, Charles Drelincourt (1595-1669), and Jean Mestrezat (1592-1657), and after leaving Paris for Saumur he heard lectures from Louis Cappel (1585-1658), Josue de la Place (1596-1665), and Amyraut himself; all three were hypothetical universalists and, according to Pictet, the "greatest theologians" of Saumur.[443] It is a wonder how Turretin finished his studies without being thoroughly convinced of hypothetical universalism. There is no evidence that he had a poor relationship with any Amyrauldian theologian as he would often write to Daillé and Daillé made no attempt to conceal his desire for Turretin to enjoy his time in Saumur.[444] Turretin's formal studies came to an end while he was in Paris and the professors there recommended him highly to the Company in Geneva writing that they were sure Turretin would serve the evangelical church in a manner worthy of his charge and education.[445]

---

[440] Nicole argues that by blaming the statements and not the conclusions, the Synod was only "indirectly" indicting Amyrauldianism: *Ibid*., p. 11.
[441] Van Stam, *Controversy*, pp. 448-9.
[442] Much of this correspondence is found in BPU, MS FR 486. Immediately after leaving Paris, Daillé wrote to Turretin hoping that he would enjoy his time in Saumur and commending his studies to God: BPU, MS FR 486, f. 105, p. 1.
[443] Pictet, "Funeral Oration," p. 665.
[444] BPU, MS FR 486, f. 105, p. 1.
[445] *Vie Turretini*, p. 33.

Leger continued to write to Turretin during this time, often criticising the Amyraut sympathizers. In March 1646, Leger wrote Turretin while he was in Saumur specifically mentioning the controversy over the imputation of Adam's sin.[446] This controversy concerned whether Adam's sin in Genesis 3 caused all people to be guilty of sin or whether the original sin simply caused death to enter into the world.[447] In the March letter Leger writes:

> Non miror in questione difficilima deprehendere magnum virum quod dissentientibus abiiciat, iis que negotium facessat dum perspicuam probationem ab illis exigit imputationis praedicti Adami que aliter a multis exponit dum considerant χρίμα unde κατάκριμα Rom. 5 maledictionem et iram Dei in totam humanitatam natalem effundens cuius massa tota erat in Adamo et Eva cum peccarunt.[448]

Leger was not surprised by the growing heterodoxy in Saumur, but lamented that theologians like Amyraut were so easily throwing away what he believed scripture warranted.

Before returning to Geneva, Turretin made two final stops in France, first in Montauban then in Nîmes. Leger was relieved that Turretin had left Saumur, writing in August 1646, "Je loue le Seigneur de tout mon couer que vous trouvez a Montauban la solide simplicite de la vraye theologie: je croy que vous ferez semblable jugement de l'Academie de Dieu."[449] Leger was certainly hoping that Turretin would identify with the 'orthodox' at Montauban, knowing that he had spent such considerable time in the

---

[446] BPU, MS Lullin 54, f. 111, p. 1.
[447] For a good evaluation of the various positions and some twentieth-century opinions, see J. Murray, "Imputation of Adam's Sin," *Westminster Theological Journal*, 18-19 (1956), pp. 146-62, 25-44.
[448] BPU, MS Lullin 54, f. 111, p.1.
[449] *Ibid*., f. 112, p. 1.

midst of a heterodox ideology. In Montauban Antoine Garrisoles (1587-1651) "occupied the chair of theology when it was adorned with the highest praise of Reformation Europe."[450] Garrisoles was a moderator at the Synod of Charenton (1645) and he defended the Reformed church against the king of France, Louis XIV. The king had sent Monsieur de Coumont to the Synod on his behalf. Needless to say, the Reformed Synod was not impressed with his remarks:

> He made a speech, which was no better than a mingle-mangle of base adulations to the King; of exhortations to passive obedience; of ridiculous complaints, against what had never been complained of before; of unjust orders which could not be complied with, without renouncing their religion; of severities more capable of exasperating than of encouraging his hearers.[451]

Garrisoles responded in "humility and submission" and "he acquiesced to whatever could be yielded with a safe conscience, and promised obedience to most part of the articles."[452] In addition, Nicolas remarks that Garrisoles was a defender of Protestantism from without and within. At the Synod of Alençon in 1637, Garrisoles had ordered Amyraut to cease his writings concerning hypothetical universalism. The Synod, though, decided not to condemn Amyraut and instead "to bury the complaints of either party in eternal oblivion."[453]

---

[450] Pictet, "Funeral Oration," p. 665.
[451] S. Laval, *A Compendious History of the Reformation, and of the Reformed Churches of France. From the First Beginnings of the Reformation, to the Repealing of the Edict of Nantz with an Account of the Late Perfection of the French Protestants under Louis XIV. Extracted out of the best Authorities* (7 vols, London, 1737-43), IV book 3, pp. 1036-7.
[452] *Ibid*., p. 1037.
[453] M. Nicolas, *Histoire de l'Ancienne Académie Protestante de Montauban (1598-1659) et de Puylaurens: Publiée sons les auspices de la Faculté de théologie protestante de Montauban* (Montauban, 1885), p. 174. "Mais les explications données par le professeur de Saumur furent acceptées par l'assemblée, qui jugea qu'il convenait d'ensevelir dans un éternel oubli les plaints portées par l'un et l'autre parti."

Finally, after a few years away from Geneva, Turretin returned. Pictet sums this period up fondly, writing "Thus he passed through all of France, leaving behind everywhere a longing for his return, and sprinkling abroad the highly fragrant odour of his name."[454] Pictet is correct in his assertion that Turretin passed through a considerable portion of Protestant France and the Netherlands absorbing a substantial range of theological, philosophical, and scientific learning. In addition, he gained first-hand knowledge of the theological strands of Reformed Protestantism. Turretin clearly did not shy away from heterodoxy, as he would have seen it; instead, he immersed himself in all that seventeenth-century Protestantism had to offer and emerged in Geneva fully convinced of orthodoxy.

(iii) Ministry in Geneva

Upon returning to Geneva, Turretin had little time to rest; on 25 June 1647 the Venerable Company of Pastors of Geneva approved Turretin as a pastor to the holy ministry after confirming his 'solidité en la doctrine' and the demonstration of 'grande erudition.'[455] The Venerable Company agreed that Turretin was more than sufficient, but in order to enforce their regulations they required Turretin to take a Latin exam on the Old Testament.[456] The following week the Venerable Company noted that Turretin had passed his exam and he was approved to administer the sacraments, preach the Gospel, and fulfil all other functions of the Holy Ministry.[457] Pictet remarks that Turretin could have been appointed to any of the congregations as 'he spoke with equal and astounding

[454] Pictet, "Funeral Oration," p. 665.
[455] AEG, RCP 9, f. 134.
[456] *Ibid*., f. 160.
[457] *Ibid*., f. 161.

facility' in French, Latin and Italian.[458] For unknown reasons, though, Turretin took a brief trip to Lyon before beginning his ministry.[459]

In honour of Turretin's aptitude as a minister and person, and in recognition of his father Benedict, in April 1648 Turretin was assigned to the Company of Pastors without an official congregation.[460] Finally, in 1648 Turretin was called by the Italian church to be its pastor. The Venerable Company agreed and he was ordained in December 1649.[461] Surprisingly, it took several weeks for Turretin to be officially ordained through 'l'imposition des mains.' De Budé gives several reasons for this: first, Turretin requested fifteen days to reflect on his call to ministry; second, he fell ill and was absent from the Company on the day they decided to ordain him. Finally, de Budé mentions that Turretin did not have confidence in the Company, due to the fact that they, alongside, the Small Council would not allow Turretin to preach until they had done the ritual of "laying on the hands".[462] The Registers of the Petit Conseil describe Turretin's ordination process in great detail, confirming much of de Budé's report. On 20 April 1649, Turretin was commissioned to preach in various churches each Sunday, specifically the Church in Saint-Gervais[463]; 4 November, the Petit Conseil recommended Turretin's ordination to the Venerable Company[464]; 10 November, Turretin was granted two weeks to reflect on

---

[458] Pictet, "Funeral Oration," p. 665.
[459] AEG, RCP 9, f. 161.
[460] *Ibid*., f. 169. Turretin had been ministering to both the Italian and German congregations of Geneva, though.
[461] Keizer, *Turrettini*, p. 73; Dennison, "Life and Career," p. 643.
[462] *Vie Turretini*, pp. 36-7.
[463] AEG, RC 148, f. 208, ("Turrettin arresté qu'on face entendre a Messieurs de la Compagnie que le Conseil desire qu'on le face prescher de temps en temps à St. Gervais les Dimanches, ou en autre temples.")
[464] *Ibid*., f. 522, ("Spect. François Turrettin sur ce qui a esté representé qu'il n'a pas l'imposition des mains en l'Eglise Francoise; Arresté qu'il soit mandé à la Venerable Compagnie de luy bailler l'imposition des mains en ceste Eglise.")

his calling[465]; and 24 November, Turretin fell ill and the Company did not press the issue of ordination.[466] On 30 November, Turretin was called again before the Company of Pastors, but in an uncharacteristic outburst Turretin requested that his consent to ordination be retracted.[467] Turretin did not appreciate that the Venerable Company required him to attend the appointing of Jean Francois Mermillod as Professor of Philosophy. Turretin believed that the Company had done this intentionally in order to put his name in for the professorship as well, something Turretin did not want. Taking this as an insult to himself and Mermillod, Turretin requested more time to think about receiving the "laying on of hands". The Company exhorted Turretin not to delay in his calling, assuring him of their desire that he serve the Church and city.[468] De Budé mentions that Turretin as a young theologian "dont le caractère était parfois un peu prompt et susceptible."[469] Finally, on 21 December 1649 the Venerable Company ordained Turretin as a proper minister in Geneva.[470]

Geneva would not allow Turretin simply to minister to the Italian congregation, though, as he was soon appointed to the Consistory, the Venerable Company, and he was asked to preach at the French congregation on occasion.[471] Before he could even be properly ordained, the Venerable Company received a letter from Lyon requesting

---

[465] *Ibid*., f. 536, ("à l'esgard de Spect. François Turrettin qu'outre que desia des quelque temps on luy a assigné de prescher à St. Gervais de quinzaine en quinzaine une fois leur Compagnie avoit resolu de le presenter en l'Eglise et luy bailler l'imposition des mains. Ce qu'ayant entendu il a prie la Compagnie de luy accorder terme de quinzaine…penser le qu'on luy a ottroyé.")
[466] *Ibid*., f. 555, ("à l'esgard de Sp. François Turretin pour l'exhorter à recevoir l'imposition des mains, mais que le Sieur Turretin ne s'estant trouvè en la Compagnie à cause de son imposition…")
[467] *Ibid*., f. 562, ("Monsieur le Syndic Lullin rapporte qu'on luy a donné advis que Spect. Francois Turrettin se vouloit retracter du consentement qu'il avoit donné suivant l'intention de Messeigneurs à recevoir l'imposition des mains en l'Eglise ayant esté desgousté par la procedure tenue hier en la Compagnie…")
[468] *Ibid*., f. 564.
[469] *Vie Turretini*, p. 37.
[470] AEG, RCP 9, f. 251.
[471] *Ibid*., f. 171, 174; AEG, RC 148, f. 208.

Turretin's services as their minister. The Company politely declined this offer, as they still had need for the young minister in Geneva.[472] During this period the ministry in Geneva was in turmoil. The previously mentioned Alexandre Morus was more than simply an eloquent speaker and the bane of Spanheim's existence; he was also a thorough Amyrauldian. Though Morus was soon to depart for the Netherlands, his effect on the Geneva clergy was well established by the time Turretin returned from his studies. In fact, the Venerable Company nearly denied his application for the pastorate in Geneva and only approved it after Morus complained to the Petit Conseil and they demanded that Morus be examined.[473] He was soon approved for the pastorate and in a few years Morus ascended in the Academy, first as professor of philosophy, then theology and finally rector in 1645.[474]

Morus could not keep his divergent theology to himself, though, and Gaberel writes that Morus' talents were a double-edged sword. As noted above, Morus had, by all accounts, a natural rhetorical ability. It appears, however, that Morus would often improvise from the pulpit, resulting in some less-than-appropriate sermons. Gaberel quips:

> La faveur publique était donc à son comble, et Morus la méritait sous certains rapports: c'était un prédicateur brillant, incisif, original; il avait l'art de fixer l'attention des foules; mais des défaits sérieux compromettaient ces éléments de succès. Abusant de sa facilité d'improvisation, il montait en chaire mal préparé et distrait par d'autres pensées. De là, de l'obscurité dans ses paroles. C'était même parfois pire que de l'obscurité. Il arrivait à

---

[472] *Ibid*., f. 227.
[473] J. Gaberel, *Histoire de l'Église de Genève depuis le Commencement de la Réformation jusqu'a nos Jours* (3 vols, Geneva, 1862), III pp. 118-9.
[474] *Ibid*., III p. 119.

> Morus d'oublier les convenances et de commettre des erreurs de jugement impardonnables.[475]

As an example of Morus's tendency towards heterdoxy in the pulpit, Gaberel recalls a sermon in which he told his congregation that in the Kingdom of Heaven faith will be "turned to sight", an allusion to 2 Corinthians, and the law will be abolished leaving only one kingdom where there is neither faith nor the law. This ignited a firestorm in Geneva, and Morus's co-pastors soon started denouncing him from the pulpit.[476]

In addition to causing a fracture in the Company of Pastors, Morus's works created a major division between the Venerable Company and the Council of Two Hundred. The Syndics of the small council, the four members elected to lead the council, were offended by the Council's actions, arguing that they were preaching false tales and fables and that 'ils ont l'ignorance sans conscience, et l'impudence sans science.'[477] Ultimately, the Company was concerned about three aspects of Morus theology: the non-imputation of Adam's sin; affirming that 2 Corinthians 3 only applied to the Jews; and that humans are only culpable for their personal sin. The Venerable Company published a lengthy rebuttal against Morus essentially reaffirming the Canons of Dort.[478]

When Morus was offered a position in the Netherlands, the Venerable Company urged him to accept it and he did. Eventually, Morus apologised for any problems that he had caused, claiming that he and the Venerable Company were in agreement concerning orthodox theology, citing cultural differences as the reason for the misunderstanding.

---

[475] *Ibid*., pp. 119-20.
[476] *Ibid*., p. 120, ("Dans le royaume des cieux, dit-il un jour, la foi sera changée en vue, la loi sera abolie. Singulier royaume où il n'y aura plus ni foi ni loi!")
[477] *Ibid*.
[478] There were five categories argued: 1) Original Sin; 2) Predestination; 3) Redemption; 4) the Provision of Grace; and 5) the Promises and Privileges of the Faithful: *Ibid*., pp. 121-3.

The Venerable Company responded writing that "La Compagnie est joyeuse de ce que les débats soient terminés; elle vous souhaite bénédiction et prospérité en votre voyage; puissiez-vous faire usage à la gloire de Dieu, avec la prudence nécessaire, des beaux dons qui vous sont départis! Nous vous baillons la main cordialement."[479] Gaberel argues that the fault resided on both sides of this argument: Morus at times misrepresented his opinions in order to keep his post and the Venerable Company was too hostile towards anyone who swayed, even in the minutest detail, from the theology of Calvin as they saw it.[480]

Turretin's return to Geneva was in the midst of this division. News of the Morus problem had reached Salmasius in the Netherlands, who was sympathetic towards Morus and angry about the way in which he was being treated by the Venerable Company. Turretin was commissioned by the Company to respond to Salmasius. Again, the Venerable Company approved the letter, but it was not authorized by the Syndics of the Petit Council and never made it to the Low Countries.[481] Daillé's continued correspondence also indicates that Spanheim's three-volume work against Amyraut, *Disputatio de Gratia Universali* (1644-8), was on Turretin's mind. Daillé himself received a copy and was eager to read it, even conceding that it could change his mind on the subject.[482] Amyraut, though, was somewhat annoyed by the length of Spanheim's work, believing that his response would continue to enflame the conflict between

---

[479] *Ibid*., p. 124.
[480] *Ibid*., p. 125. Gaberel references Calvin in his assessment of the theology of the Venerable Company, calling their interpretation of him 'despotic' Calvinism. Gaberel's appraisal of *l'affaire de Morus* is generally sober, so it is surprising to see him give such a negative description of the opinions of the Venerable Company.
[481] *Vie Turretini*, p. 36.
[482] Daillé to Turretin, 12 May 1646: BPU, MS FR 486, f. 105, p. 1., ("Je n'ai pas encore recent son livre, et tous que se vous avouë, que j'ai un peu d'impatience d'essayer si 3 vol. serons capable des me faire rendre.")

brothers.[483] Turretin had asked Daillé about Amyraut's response, hoping that it would adequately address Spanheim's accusations in a way that stemmed the flow of dissention within the Reformed Church. Daillé agreed, and his hope was that Amyraut would do what was most beneficial for the glory of God.[484]

Though Turretin and Daillé were on competing sides of a theological issue, they remained united against the other Christian confessions. In a letter dated 7 July 1647, Daillé wrote to Turretin about a theological quarrel one of his Reformed colleagues was having with some Lutherans over the nature of the sacrament of Communion. Daillé was concerned that a Reformed church in his area was not adequately prepared to answer the objections presented by the Lutherans. Daillé believed that the Lutherans had a much better understanding of their theology of the sacraments and he asked that Turretin request assistance from Jean Diodati in Geneva in order to resolve the matter.[485] It is unclear whether Turretin proceeded to assist Daillé with his problem, but this shows that the Reformed church was unified in its defence of its confession. There certainly was significant internal strife, but Daillé was still confident enough in the internal cohesion of *l'Eglise Reformée* to seek the aid of those who did not agree fully on all matters of theology. In addition, this illustrates Turretin's continued prominence amongst the Reformed. Surely Daillé sent letters to other prominent theologians as well, but he, nevertheless, felt it was prudent to inform Turretin of the continued attack on Reformed theology.

---

[483] *Idem*, 26 February 1647: *Ibid*., f. 106, p. 1.
[484] *Ibid*., ("Dieu vueille conseiller a M.A. ce que sera le plus utile pour sa gloire et pour l'edification de ses peuples.")
[485] *Ibid*., f. 107, p.1.

In March 1650, the Venerable Company voted unanimously to appoint Turretin as the Chair of Philosophy at the Academy, but he refused due to his duties as minister to the Italian congregation.[486] It would be two years until Turretin received another invitation, again from the church in Lyon.[487] The church sent a letter to Turretin's mother knowing she retained considerable influence over the young theologian. Keizer writes, "De même qu'elle avait eu recours en 1649 à l'oncle de François, Diodati, elle s'adressa cette fois à "medemoiselle Turtin" sa mère. Emue de la détresse de Lyon, l'Eglise de Genève céda pour trois mois son pasteur et cette période fut même prolongée de plus de trois autres mois."[488] The troubles in Lyon had reached Daillé in Paris and he was very troubled about the church's future in Lyon, writing to Turretin, "J'ai appris l'état de l'Eglise de Lyon, que je deplore avecque vous. Leur Synode auroit remedié a ce desordre s'il se fut a tenu a temps. Encore ne pense-je pas qu'il puisse desormais guerres tarder; ce qui me fait esperer, que ce malentendu se finira bien tost."[489] This time the Venerable Company approved Lyon's request, insisting that Turretin only remain there for three or four months.[490] Three months soon turned into ten, as the city continued to require his assistance. Eventually, Geneva had to demand Turretin's return, as Lyon insisted on keeping Turretin indefinitely. Lyon was clearly thankful for Turretin's service to the city and the ministers of the churches in Lyon wrote Geneva a letter soon after Turretin's

---

[486] AEG, RCP 9, f. 266; AEG, RC 149, f. 150; *Vie Turretini*, pp. 39-40; Keizer, *Turrettini*, pp. 74-75. Dennison, "Life and Career," p. 645.
[487] AEG, RCP 10, f. 6.
[488] Keizer, *Turrettini*, p. 75.
[489] 7 July 1651: BPU, MS FR 486, f. 120, p. 1.
[490] Turretin was in Lyon as early as the 11 February. Leger sent him a letter on 11 February 1652, seeking Turretin's help in advising a friend of Leger concerning the "rekindling" of the faith in Italy. Leger also mentions that Turretin's mother is sick, but he is praying for her recovery: BPU, MS Lullin 54, f. 113, p. 1.

arrival thanking them for their generosity[491] and when Turretin finally left the members of his church wrote a poem praising his work and lamenting his departure.[492]

Turretin's time in Lyon was not without controversy, however. Aaron Morus, the son of Alexander, unexpectedly died in 1652 and, while he was sick, attempted to recruit Turretin for the second time.[493] Turretin's co-pastor in Lyon, Samuel Rouph, was forced to retire one month after Turretin's appointment, leaving him solely in charge of the parish.[494] Rouph's retirement was due to a falling out with members of the Lyon Consistory and in March 1652 the Consistory, in agreement with the influential families in Lyon, removed Rouph from his position. This caused a division within the church of Lyon, with many siding with Rouph. Rouph's supporters threatened to start a new church and install Rouph as their pastor. However, the affair was brought before the provincial Synod of Burgundy in 1652 which confirmed the decision of the Consistory. Rouph "had the good sense to retire" and he was soon called by the town of Gex, near Geneva, to be their pastor. Turretin was torn about this conflict and he sought the advice of Daillé in Paris. Unfortunately for Turretin, Daillé was not helpful pragmatically. Instead, Daillé stressed that Turretin have an egalitarian mind-set, respecting the Synod's decisions.[495] In addition to keeping the French church intact, Turretin was also called upon to arbitrate a dispute between the Consistory and some prominent families concerning the use of city funds. De Budé tells us that Turretin was able to resolve the

---

[491] AEG, RCP 10, f. 11. The Venerable Company made note of Turretin's continued work in Lyon in April 1652 and they approved his ministry for three more months: *Ibid.*, ff. 17-18. Again, on 7 September 1652 they approved Turrettin for another two months: *Ibid*., ff. 46-7.
[492] Keizer, *François Turrettini*, p. 75. AEG, RCP 10, f. 54 notes that the Venerable Company received a letter of thanks for Turretin's work in Lyon dated 3 December 1652.
[493] *Vie Turretini*, p. 46.
[494] *Ibid*., pp. 48-9.
[495] 8 March 1652: BPU, MS FR 486, f. 122, p. 1.

dispute after considerable thought and through the fear of God, but he does not inform us of Turretin's ultimate decision. Either way, Turretin proved himself to be an indispensable resource in re-uniting the city.[496] The poem written by the people encapsulates their love for Turretin, referring to him as "Estoile du matin" and "homme de Dieu bénit" and reiterating their sadness at losing him to Geneva.[497] Finally, in late 1652, the Vénérable Company could no longer afford to supply Turretin to Lyon and he was recalled in December of that year.

Over the next few years, Turretin continued to serve as minister and member of the Venerable Company of Pastors.[498] Daillé mentions a series of theological theses that Turretin wrote in the mid-1650s, most likely referring to Turretin's 1657 writing, φανερωσις της πιστεως προς την συνειδησιν, *sive elucidationis de fidei et religionis christianae necessitate et veritate*.[499] Throughout much of this time, the Venerable Company and Small Council were debating the city's fortification problem. On 23 March 1660 the city's prayers were dedicated to its defense, calling on God to surround them "as the mountains surround Jerusalem."[500] Finally, on 22 February 1661 Turretin was elected as the representative of Geneva sent to the Low Countries on a mission to raise funds.[501] His father, Benedict, had made the same trip forty years earlier, but the

---

[496] For this story, I am indebted to *Vie Turretini,* pp. 49-52.
[497] *Vie Turretini*, pp. 59-60.
[498] In addition, he was appointed to the Academy, but his service there will be addressed below, pp. 155-74.
[499] 6 November 1657: BPU, MS FR 486, f. 187, p. 1 ("Je vous remercie tres humblement de la faveur que vous me faites de m'envoier la suite de vos theses, que je lis avec un singulier contentement, les trouvant extremement belles, claires, nettes, judicieuses, et fortes; et vous asseure que je le garde cherement, vous priant de me continuer la mêsme grace a l'avenir.") Thesis title from Keizer, *François Turrettini*, p. 76: "Manifestation of the faith to the Conscience, or an explanation concerning the necessity and truth of the most Christian faith and duty."
[500] AEG, Notices, 23 March 1660: The allusion concerning Jerusalem is from Psalm 125:2, "As the mountains surround Jerusalem, so the LORD surrounds his people both now and forevermore." NIV
[501] AEG, RCP 11, f. 162

city believed that its defences were still susceptible to the armies of various powers of Early Modern Europe, specifically the Duke of Savoy.

Turretin was reluctant about his trip to the Netherlands, fearing that he would not be able to accomplish the goals.[502] In addition to Turretin's self-conscious fears, there were conflicting reports regarding the status of the Low Country's treasury. Europe was embroiled in war and the Low Country was exhausted by the needs of its navy. However, the Venerable Company received a letter confirming the Low Country's willingness to call on its churches to support Geneva against Savoy.[503] Turretin eventually conceded that Geneva was in dire need of funds and consented to go to the Netherlands on the canton's behalf.

Turretin left for the Netherlands on 3 May 1661 alongside his younger brother Benedict. On his way, Turretin stopped first in Basel where he solidified many relationships that would become intrinsic to his time as professor and rector at the Academy.[504] Specifically, Turretin was able to spend time with Lucas Gernler[505] (1625-75) who would later help write the *Helvetic Consensus* (1675) with Turretin and John Henry Heideggar. Gernler and Turretin were already acquainted, however, as their studies in Geneva briefly overlapped.[506] Turretin and the Venerable Company's strategy in the Netherlands was both political and ecclesiastical. Turretin was given letters addressed to several prominent leaders in the community, including the professor of theology at the Leiden Academy, Abraham Heidanus (1597-1678), the Professor of

---

[502] *Vie Turretini*, pp. 74-5; AEG, RCP 11, ff. 162-3.
[503] *Vie Turretini*, pp. 76-7.
[504] Leger mentions Turretin's brief stop and hopes that his trip will go from 'bien a mieux': Leger to Turretin, 14 May 1661: MS Lullin 54, f. 131, p. 1.
[505] Gernler was a contemporary of Turretin who studied in Basel, Geneva, and France before returning to Basel as professor of theology and Old Testament.
[506] Keizer, *François Turrettini*, p. 78.

Theology in Groningen, Samuel des Marets (1599-1673), the Prince of Orange, William III (who was only ten years of age at the time), and the prince's mother, the Dowager Princess Mary.[507] In addition, Turretin spent considerable time in the various churches of the Netherlands preaching and advancing the cause of Geneva to the people. He was so successful in The Hague and Leiden that he was offered a position as pastor, which he humbly declined. Instead, Keizer reports that the congregations of The Hague donated 1,000 florins in honour of his eloquent and edifying sermons.[508]

Turretin's correspondence with the Venerable Company makes no mention of any discord existing amongst the congregations there. He was, however, commissioned to investigate two recent works, one against Calvin written by the English Anglican Peter Heylin (1599-1662)[509] and the other a book wrongfully attributed to Theodore Beza entitled *Vindiciae adversus Tyrannos*. The Venerable Company was desperate to get their hands on a copy of these works as Heylin's book was recently mentioned in the *London Gazette* and *Vindiciae* was currently being published in Amsterdam.[510] Turretin responded with a lengthy letter[511] stating that he wrote to Philippe Mestrezat (1618-90) asking him to look into the *Vindiciae*, indicating that he had full confidence in Mestrezat's ability to uncover the mystery. In terms of Heylin's work, Turretin had considerably more to say. "Le livre est en Anglais en 4° a titre gros et fort imprimé dans

---

[507] William III was Prince of Orange from 1650-1702 (his death), and King of England, Scotland, France and Ireland from 1689-1702.
[508] I am indebted to Keizer for this story: Keizer, *François Turrettini*, pp. 79-80.
[509] For more on Heylin's life and thought see: A. Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylin* (Manchester, 2007).
[510] *Ibid*., pp. 80-1. The Venerable Company also wrote to ministers in England hoping to confiscate as many copies as possible. ("Nous ecrirons à Mr Stouppe notre frère ou à quelque autre qu s'ils en peuvent recouvrer quelque copie ou exemplaire qu'ils nous le fassent tenir et si d'aventure vous le pouvez trouver plutost que vous nous en donnez avis et mesme nous l'envoyer ou apporter avec vous.")
[511] This letter is reproduced in *Ibid*., pp. 81-3, dated The Hague 10 October 1661.

l'an 1658, mais comme il n'estait pas alors de saison il n'a paru que depuis peu. L'autheur a esté chapelain du feu Roy et est en grand credit parmis les *Episcopaux*. On m'imforme qu'il a fait deux autres livres qui ne sont pas moins injurieux."[512] Turretin relays the major points of one of Heylin's other books, *History of the Reformation of England* (1661), stating Heylin's argument that the Church of England of his day was the only true Reformed church, and railing against both Calvin and the staunch Calvinist King Edward VI, who was full of bad ideas and whose death should not have been mourned by the English people.[513] Turretin promised to purchase a copy and bring it back to Geneva with him, but he also brought the situation to the attention of the governing body of The Hague which likewise found the work offensive and Turretin hoped they would take action against its further dissemination.[514]

In the end, Turretin's time in the Netherlands was an unmitigated success.[515] His pleas were responded to generously and the people of the Netherlands pledged 75,000 florins for the rebuilding of the walls of Geneva. Without the Turretin family, Geneva may well have been invaded by the Savoyards and lost the independence it prides itself on even to this day. Turretin returned to Geneva *via* Paris, but it was not an entirely happy occasion. During his time in the Netherlands, Turretin's long-time friend and

---

[512] *Ibid*., pp. 81-2.
[513] *Ibid*., p. 82. "On m'informe qu'il a fait deux autres livres qui ne sont pas moins injurieux. Le premier est un fol. qui a pour titre: *Histoire de la Reformation d'Angleterre,* la ou il tasche de prouver qu'il n'y a que la seule Eglise anglicane qui soit veritament reformee et declame d'une estrange façon contre monsieur Calvin et sa reformation et s'emporte mesmes contre le Roi Edouard VI sous lequel se fit la reformation en Angleterre disant qu'il estoit rempli de mauvais principes et qu'on n'avait pas sujet de regretter sa mort." This is most likely referring to Heylin's *Ecclesia Restaurata* (London, 1661): Milton, *Laudian and Royalist*, pp. 197-213.
[514] *Ibid*.
[515] In fact, throughout the 1660s Turretin was repeatedly asked to return to the Netherlands as preacher and/or pastor. On the 19 October 1666 the Venerable Company notes that Turretin received a letter from Leiden requesting his services, but he was forced to decline due to his work in Geneva: AEG, RCP 12, f. 108.

fellow theologian Antoine Leger had died, ending many years' worth of fruitful correspondence and mutual admiration.

Turretin was considered an engaging speaker who had a keen sense of propriety in terms of his pastoral duties. Gaberel writes:

> Francois Turretin était un prédicateur incisif et profond; il trouvait dans l'energie de ses impressions religieuses des mots qui frappaient l'imagination et la conscience de ses auditeurs. Un jour, dans sa visite de paroisse, il recut diverses plaintes sur la longueur de l'epreuve de la Revocation infligee aux Eglises, et sur les mysteres des jugements divins qui toleraient depuis tant d'annees les iniquites du despote francais. Le dimance suivant, Fr. Turretin prêcha sur ce text: Il est patient, parce qu'il est Eternel, et ses auditeurs conserverent le souvenir des paroles suivantes: "La justice divine marche avec des pieds de laine, mais lorsqu'elle atteint le coupable, elle le saisit avec une main de fer."[516]

Turretin's pastoral abilities were well attested to in Pictet's funeral oration. Pictet mentions that Turretin did not capture the attention of his listeners with eloquent speech alone, but with "solid doctrine, now historical and full, now unpolished and despised, shunning the noble kind of speaking, and anxiously on his guard lest his speech bring forth only leaves through an excessive arrangement of words."[517] Again, Pictet's oration is meant to evoke an overwhelmingly positive feeling in its listeners; Gaberel and Pictet illustrate Turretin's desire to remain steadfast to what he considered the true Christian faith in both his pastoral and theological life. Turretin was not one to keep orthodoxy to himself; he desired that all members of the Church remain faithful to their calling whether under threat from heterodoxy or from French oppression. For Turretin, the Christian faith entailed an intrinsic existential response: the Christian was called to follow

---

[516] Gaberel, *Histoire*, III p. 91.
[517] Pictet, "Funeral Oration," III p. 667.

God in all aspects of his life, whether it was theological, moral, ethical, or charitable.[518] Like Calvin before him, Turretin exhorted and practised his faith in a way that adhered to all aspects of the Reformed Confession and he expected his flock and colleagues to do the same.

(iv) Turretin at the Academy

Upon his return from Lyon in 1652, the Venerable Company of Pastors wasted no time assigning Turretin his next task, establishing him as professor of theology at the Academy on 17 December 1652 on the recommendation of Philippe Mestrazat and Turretin's brother-in-law, André Pictet.[519] News of his appointment spread quickly, as he received a letter from the rector of the Academy in Montélimart in early 1653 wishing him luck on his new vocation.[520] Though the decision to elect him as professor was a popular one, Turretin's time at the Academy was arguably the most complicated and controversial aspect of his life. As noted above, the development of hypothetical universalism greatly impacted all aspects of Genevan culture and life, though none more than in the Academy. Amyrauldianism, however, was not the only new development

---

[518] Pictet writes concerning Turretin's pastoral convictions, "Let others relate with what great "outspokenness" (parrēsia) he inveighed against the morals of our age. He was entirely a stranger to that servile silence which, consistent with the divine oracles, Justinian himself prohibited in such men. With what great strength of spirit he thundered against public lapses into vice, exhorting individuals toward penitence with copious tears, so that the same matters would leave the faithful not without eager counsel, but with paternal affection toward those with whom he was angry and with longing that they be moved for the public good": *Ibid*.

[519] AEG, RCP 10, f. 57 and RC 152, f. 12, which states, "Se sont presenté les Spectables Pasteurs, Pictet et Mestrezat, recteur, requerant qui suivant l'advis de leur Compagnie Spectable Francois Turrettin soit receu Professeur en theologie et qu'il preste serment à forme des ordannances, apres quoy le dit Spectable Francois Turrettin s'est presenté, et à presté le dit serment." The secretary of the day's meeting mistakenly wrote Benedict Turrettin instead of Turretin and Benedict's name had to be crossed out and Turretin's name was written in the margins. This somewhat solidifies Pictet's repeated claim that Turretin was Benedictus *redivivus*.

[520] *Vie Turretini*, p. 62.

during this time. The French philosopher René Descartes (1596-1650) became an influential participant in the intellectual life of Early Modern Europe in general and of Geneva in particular. It will be beneficial, therefore, before continuing Turretin's life to understand the development of Cartesianism and its relation to the theological and philosophical ethos of the Academy of Geneva.

Excursis--Descartes and Cartesianism[521]

Widely considered one of the giants of Western philosophy,[522] René Descartes was born in Touraine, France, 31 March 1596 and three days later was baptized into the Roman Catholic Church. René was essentially raised as an orphan due to his father's hectic work and travel schedule and the fact that his mother died only a year after giving birth to him.[523] He was educated at a Jesuit school established by the French King Henry IV in which students were taught logic, rhetoric, grammar, philosophy and theology. It is believed that René would have been trained in traditional Aristotelian philosophy and the theology of Thomas Aquinas. After his studies, René spent some time travelling, attempting to discern his professional calling. "In many ways he drifted, both intellectually and geographically, without any clear plan of where he was going or what precisely he was looking for."[524] Eventually he landed in the Netherlands in the midst of the Reformed confession's Synod of Dort.

---

[521] I am relying heavily upon Desmond Clarke's *Descartes: A Biography* (Cambridge, 2006).
[522] His most famous saying being "cogito ergo sum" - "I think, therefore I am" - found in *Discourse on the Method*.
[523] Clarke, *Descartes*, pp. 9-10.
[524] *Ibid*., pp. 37-8.

An important turning-point in Descartes's life came when he met the mathematician Isaac Beeckman (1588-1637). Beeckman was a trained minister, mathematician, and doctor of medicine and he and Descartes discussed a variety of topics, including music, which led to Descartes's first essay *Compendium of Music* (1618).[525] Descartes continued to write on mathematics, attempting to rationalize the way a person can come to know everything about the universe. This became his *Rules* (1626-8). Though not completed, it shows Descartes's desire to use innovative mathematical proofs and mechanics to explain the universe concretely. This was a decisive turn away from Aristotelian metaphysics, which stressed the 'matter' and 'form' of all things. Descartes continued to write extensively on the mechanics of the universe, humanity, and the soul. He soon found, however, that his new theology was not welcome in every part of Europe.

As detailed above, many within the Reformed community of the early seventeenth century believed Cartesianism to threaten orthodoxy. Descartes himself did not wish to wade into the theological debates of the time and he did not believe that his views were in any way a danger to the classic theology in which he was raised. Writing to a former teacher, Descartes commented, "Since I know that the principal reason why your colleges very carefully reject every kind of novelty in philosophical matters is your fear that they will also bring about some change in theology, I would like to emphasize at this point that there is nothing to fear on that count from my views."[526] Ernst Bizer convincingly shows that many within the Netherlands considered Cartesianism akin to atheism, as Descartes's metaphysics undermined traditional Aristotelian proofs for the existence of

[525] *Ibid*., pp. 42-3.
[526] Clarke, *Descartes*, p. 21. Descartes is quoted from a letter to Father Noël, dated October 1637.

God.[527] Again, this was not Descartes's intention; Bizer indicates that Descartes's philosophy did try to prove the existence of God, in general, if not necessarily the Christian God.[528] This novel philosophy, like the theology of Amyraut, was never outright condemned by the Reformed, though. This is most likely due to the variegated nature of the teaching of philosophy throughout the Netherlands.[529] Descartes continued to write throughout the rest of his life. Finally, in 1650 he died in Stockholm, Sweden, aged 53.

The works of Descartes quickly spread throughout the world, arriving in England during the 1640s, in France in the early 1660s, and into the United States in the 1680s.[530] The dissemination of Cartesianism into the Academy of Geneva was primarily due to the appointment of Jean-Robert Chouet (1641-1731) as professor of philosophy. Chouet had previously served as professor of philosophy in Saumur, bringing the new system to the French academy. Chouet, like Turretin, has a complicated historiography. Heyd has detailed the history of scholarship concerning Chouet and argues that the majority of eighteenth and nineteenth-century works portray Chouet with a positivity that "dismissed scholasticism as an exercise in futile speculation, while hailing modern science as the expression of an empirical approach to nature, free from the fetters of repressive scholastic authoritarianism."[531] Therefore, unlike Turretin, Chouet's legacy has

---

[527] E. Bizer, "Reformed Orthodoxy and Cartesianism," *Journal for Theology and the Church*, 2 (1965), pp. 20-4.
[528] *Ibid*., p. 24.
[529] This is the opinion of Heyd, at least. It is favoured here as the overwhelming evidence shows a burgeoning of variety in many areas of intellectual life in Early Modern Europe: see M. Heyd, *Between Orthodoxy and the Enlightenment: Jean-Robert Chouet and the Introduction of Cartesian Science in the Academy of Geneva* (The Hague, 1982), p. 5.
[530] *Ibid*., pp. 5-6.
[531] *Ibid*., p. 19.

benefitted from a plethora of bias in favour of his innovations over those of his opponents at the Academy.

Turretin's and Chouet's early lives are immensely similar in that they were both born and raised in Geneva to well-established families. Chouet's grandfather was Theodore Tronchin, the respected and highly influential professor of theology and Genevan representative at the Synod of Dort. After studying at the Academy, Chouet went quickly to Nîmes where he "defended philosophical theses which represented the next stage of his philosophical development" towards Cartesianism.[532] Heyd notes that it is difficult to discern when Chouet fully embraced Cartesianism as his Nîmes theses were not wholly Cartesian, though entirely un-Aristotelian. After returning from Nîmes, Jacques Roussier, a student during Chouet's time, described Chouet as someone who was unlearned in theology, but had learned some Gassendi[533], Descartes, and Derodon[534], while neglecting Aristotle.[535] Roussier had a clearly unfavourable view of Chouet,[536] yet his comments illustrate Chouet's priorities and his uniqueness amongst the Reformed communities in Geneva.

Ultimately, Heyd believes that Chouet's conversion was gradual and most likely came during his time studying under Gaspard Wyss (1635-1668)[537] in Geneva, David

---

[532] *Ibid*., p. 22.
[533] Pierre Gassendi (1592-1655) was a French philosopher who wrote in contrast to Descartes and the Aristotelians for an empiric epistemology, or an epistemology based upon sensory perception: S. Fisher, "Pierre Gassendi," in E. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2014) [acc. 2 November 2015: http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/gassendi/].
[534] David Derodon (1600-1664) was the philosophy professor at Nîmes. Though Derodon was a scholastic Protestant, he was put on trial for heresy in 1658 at the Synod of Nîmes for publishing a text anonymously in 1645, *Disputatio de Supposito*, defending the heretic Nestorius. The Synod absolved him, but it would have no doubt tarnished his reputation: Heyd, *Between Orthodoxy*, pp. 57-8.
[535] *Ibid*., ("d'un grand orgueil, d'avoir causé de grands désordres dans Genève pour le Préteur, de ne savoir rien en Théologie, d'entendre véritablement un peu la Philosophie de M. Gassendi, Descartes, et Derodon, mais n'avoir jamais lu ni Aristote ni les Scolastiques...")
[536] Heyd refers to him as Chouet's 'enemy.'
[537] Wyss served as professor of philosophy from 1656-1688: *Université Genève*, I p. 641.

Derodon (1600-1664) in Nîmes, and through the possible influence of his uncle, Louis Tronchin (1629-1705).[538] Wyss and Derodon were not Cartesian, but they dealt with Descartes's writings in their courses to the degree that Chouet could have been greatly influenced. Amyrauldianism and Cartesianism would coalesce when Chouet was appointed as professor of philosophy at Saumur in 1664. In 1669 he would return to Geneva, where he would spend the remainder of his life. It is important, then, to understand the founding and development of Cartesianism at the Academy of Geneva. Descartes had certainly made an impact upon the Reformed Tradition and Turretin's return to Geneva from the Netherlands in 1652 is amidst this fermenting division.

Turretin's inaugural lecture as professor was on Hebrews 1:1, "Long ago God spoke to our ancestors in many and various ways by the prophets";[539] he began his tenure as professor in theology on 21 February 1653.[540] Barely a year later, on 8 March 1654, Turretin was elected rector of the Academy for the first time.[541] Over the course of his rectorate, Turretin gave several orations that were lauded by Pictet, including: *De hujus Scholae et Academiae Natali die*, *De Alexandri VII Tiberini Pontificis electione*, *De Virtutis ac Veritatis amico consortion, indivulsoque nexu*, and *De Praejudiciis Evangelicorum Christianam concordiam impedientibus*.[542] Again, Turretin showed his concern for a variety of topics regarding the Christian faith. His orations ranged from teaching on the value of Christian virtue to a diagnosis of the inner struggle of the

---

[538] Heyd does not know whether it was Chouet who influenced Tronchin or vice-versa: Heyd, *Between Orthodoxy*, pp. 23-4.
[539] NIV.
[540] AEG, RCP 10, f. 64.
[541] *Ibid*., f. 124 and AEG, RC 153, f. 80.
[542] Pictet, "Funeral Oration," p. 669. Translated titles by G. Giger, in order: "Concerning the Birthday of our School and Academy", "Concerning the Election of Alexander VII Tiberias as Pope", "Concerning the Friendly Association and Inseparable Connection of Virtue and Truth", and "Concerning the Prejudices Impeding Christian Concord in the Spread of the Gospel."

Reformed Confession, to the impact of the newly elected Pope. Turretin was reflecting the multifaceted theological and political landscape of Early Modern Europe and the need to engage with opponents of orthodox Christianity whether they pertained to the individual believer or to the tradition as a whole. Borgeaud argues that Turretin put his considerable influence behind those who were against Amyraut's theology, particularly Louis Tronchin.[543] While Borgeaud is correct that Turretin was staunchly against Amyrauldianism, it is too simplistic to sum up his time in the Academy as Saumur *versus* Calvin. Turretin was certainly concerned about hypothetical universalism, but he was primarily concerned with right teaching in all its aspects of the Christian life, not just atonement.

Regardless, the 1650s and early 1660s remained a relatively peaceful period at the Academy. *L'Affaire de Morus* had subsided in Geneva in favour of orthodoxy, while France upheld the theology of Saumur. At the Synod of Loudon in 1659, Turretin's friend Daillé and his colleague David Blondel (1590-1655) published a series of theological volumes in defence of Amyrauldianism. In response, Jacques Gautier (d. 1674), Louis Du Moulin (1606-1680) and Samuel des Marets (1599-1673) spoke out against Amyraut and de la Place. The Synod declared Amyrauldianism orthodox and it became an acceptable position in France.[544] Geneva was not as accommodating at this

---

[543] *Université Genève*, I p. 359.

[544] The Synod concluded: "One of the Provinces having complained against Monsieur Amyraud, Pastor and Professor of Theology at Saumur, as if he had violated the Canons of the Synod of Alanson, by printing his Book of Reprobation, and some others, and the Province of Anjou, and the same Monsieur Amyraud, in the name of the Church and University of Saumur, who had deputed and charged him with their Letters, remonstrating that several other Provinces had transgressed those very Canons; and after hearing the Provincial Deputies of Poictou, and the said Mr. Amyraud, about his Proceedings, both in publishing those Books of his since the last National Synod, and the Doctrine contained in them: This Assembly was well satisfied with those Explications given by the said Mr. Amyrald, agreeing with the Synod of Alanson, and judging that those mutual Complaints on all sides, of violating the Canons, ought to be buried in the Grave of an Holy Oblivion, did dismiss him the Honour to the exercise of his Professorial Office, and exhorted

time, though, and it developed into the conservative stronghold of Reformed Protestantism.[545] There were, therefore, two competing visions of Reformed Orthodoxy, one supralapsarian and one infralapsarian.[546] This debate would soon reach its zenith in Geneva and Turretin would intervene in the controversy becoming the champion of the traditional and conservative faction of the Protestant Reformed Tradition.

In 1649 the Venerable Company decided that in order to guard theological purity within the Academy every student and teacher would be required to sign a thesis declaring, "Vous promettez de fuir les nouveautés de la doctrine sur l'universalité de la grâce et de la non imputation du péché d'Adam" and "Vous n'enseignerez rien qui ne soit conforme à la confession de foi des Églises réformées de France, aux arrêtés du synode de Dordrecht et à notre catéchisme."[547] Twenty years later, the theses became an issue within the Academy. Charles Maurice was a student at Geneva set to take his exams for the ministry, but the Venerable Company required that he subscribe to the 1649 theses.[548] Turretin's colleagues Louis Tronchin and Philippe Mestrezat, along with Maurice, did not agree with the Venerable Company, arguing that since Maurice was going to be a

---

him to bestir himself in it with Joy and Courage.": J. Quick, *Synodicon in Gallia Reformata: or the Acts, Decisions, Decrees, and Canons of those Famous National Councils of the Reformed Churches in France* (2 vols, London, 1692), II p. 560. See also Dennison, "Life and Career," pp. 644-5.

[545] It is important to make a note about 'conservative' and 'liberal' in this instance. My working definition of 'conservative' will be "those theologians and ministers within the Reformed Tradition who defended limited atonement, scholastic methodology, and the divinity of the Hebrew vowel points." These people would have signed, with enthusiasm, the forthcoming Helvetic Formula Consensus. 'Liberal' will refer to those who are more inclined towards enlightenment toleration of non-essentials (i.e. the order of the divine decrees, philosophical methods, and vowel points). One should not place any preconceived opinions upon the superiority of one over the other. In this instance, they are simply descriptive. It is also important to note that this is only in reference to the Reformed Tradition. Many Reformed Theologians who are conservative within the Reformed Tradition may have been considered liberal in contrast to Roman Catholicism and vice-versa.

[546] See above, Ch. 1, p. 20 (n. 25) concerning supralapsarian and infralapsarian views on the divine decrees.

[547] Quotes from Gaberel, *Histoire*, III p. 125. The discussion over the end of the Morus affair and the subscription to the 1649 thesis required a month of deliberation in the RCP: AEG, RCP 9, ff. 226-30.

[548] The best treatment of the Charles Maurice affair is Grohman, "Genevan Reactions," pp. 258-333.

pastor in France he was exempt from the theses.[549] This sparked a heated debate amongst the Reformed in Geneva and it is this event that would eventually lead to the *Helvetic Consensus Formula* (1675).

Turretin was concurrently serving his second term as Rector of the Geneva Academy[550] and the Venerable Company recorded the details of his original protest against Maurice:

> Monsieur le Recteur a fait plainte de ce que le vendredi XI Juin lors qu'il fut question de parler des la reception du S. Maurice apres que la pluralité des voir fust passée qu'il seroit reçeu selon nos formes ordinaires et qu'il ferait la protestation accoustumée de rejetter les nouveaux sentiments de l'universalité de la grace et de la non-imputation du [premiere] peche d'Adam.[551]

For Turretin, it seemed an obvious requirement: for Maurice to be admitted to the Academy meant that he would be held to the standards the Academy mandated. Tronchin found this requirement to be altogether unnecessary, arguing that Maurice should only be required to adhere to the word of God, the liturgy and the Catechisms.[552] Tronchin went even further, saying that if these maxims, which were the same as the Papists and Antichrist, were always followed then there would never have been a Reformation! Turretin, according to Tronchin, was holding back the Reformed church in Geneva, submitting it to the same rigidity of doctrine as the Catholic Church. Turretin

---

[549] Dennison, "Life and Career," pp. 645-6.
[550] The Venerable Company records his selection and election in AEG, RCP 12, ff. 235-6, dated 7 and 14 February 1668. One year later, in March 1669, Turretin would request that he be allowed to resign from the Rectorate citing his duties to the Italian congregation: *Ibid*., f. 338. Finally, the Company accepted his resignation and thanked him for his service: *Ibid*., f. 492 (11 February 1670).
[551] *Ibid*., f. 380 (30 July 1669).
[552] *Ibid*. ("Monsieur Tronchin qui survient alors commencer a dire qu'il ne falait plus sacrester a ces pedanteries et formalités qu'il falait se contenter d'exiger la conformité a la paroles de Dieu a notre confession de foy a la liturgie et au Catechisme etc.")

appealed to tradition concerning the theses, stating that all members of the clergy in Geneva had been held to this standard. Tronchin again disagreed saying that he had never promised anything in this regard and he would not allow himself to be held to a standard that he did not swear to.[553] Grohman declares that of the two "Turretin's argument seems to be very weak" due to the archaic and inconsistently applied nature of the 1649 theses. He simply states, "Since Turretin's attitude would seem to preclude the possibility of ever discussing these doctrinal matters again, Tronchin obviously has the stronger argument here."[554] Grohman's dismissal of Turretin's argument is certainly unfounded, as Turretin did not have any problem discussing various theologies, having spent much of his own studies amongst Amyrauldians.

Turretin responded by arguing that abrogating the theses would be akin to changing the religion passed down by their fathers. Tronchin countered by minimalizing the problem and framing it within pastoral boundaries: since Maurice was going to be a minister in France he was not beholden to the requirements of the Helvetic churches. The final vote on whether or not to require subscription of the 1649 theses was split evenly, with Turretin in the pro-theses party and Tronchin and Mestrezat against.[555] In a conciliatory move, Tronchin and Mestrezat decided to change their votes in favour of the theses and eventually Maurice was approved provided that he agree to "keep the purity of the doctrine and not to teach any new doctrines such as the universality of grace or the non-imputation of the first sin of Adam and other similar sentiments."[556] Eventually, the

---

[553] "M. Tronchin dit plus fois qu'il n'avoit rien promis a cet egard et quand il l'auroit promis que serment qui n'est pas de faire n'est pas de tenir."
[554] Grohman, "Genevan Reactions," p. 264.
[555] *Ibid*., p. 262.
[556] AEG, RCP 12, f. 363; Grohman, "Genevan Reactions," p. 262 ("de se tenir à la pureté de la doctrine et de n'enseigner aucunes nouvelles doctrine comme l'universalité de la grace la non imputation du premier peché d'Adam et autres sentiments semblables.")

Council judged that no new doctrine should be preached or taught publicly and they threatened exile, fine, prison or death to anyone caught teaching heresy.[557] This, however, did not settle the quarrel and Turretin, Tronchin and Mestrezat would continue to struggle for the rest of Turretin's life.

The divisions within the Genevan Academy reached other areas of Switzerland quickly. On 27 July 1669 a letter was co-signed and sent from Basel, Bern and Zurich to the Small Council in Geneva.[558] The pastors and professors of these three cities were perturbed that many people within Geneva had accepted new teachings and they requested that the ministers refrain from teaching anything contrary to the Reformed faith. "The Swiss pastors and professors said that if these new ideas were taught, they feared that there would be a dangerous rupture in the church. Therefore, they hoped that the Genevan Church, which had always held to the orthodox doctrine and was considered the mother of other churches, would continue to teach pure doctrine."[559] The three cities threatened to withhold students from Geneva if these innovations continued to be tolerated.[560] If Geneva succumbed to heterodoxy, then these Swiss cantons feared that all of Switzerland and the wider Reformed confession would be in danger of apostasy, as well. It appears that withholding the students was an idle threat, however, as Tronchin continued to teach at least hypothetical universalism in his classes during this time and after.[561] The controversy over the 1649 theses was not going to be extinguished anytime

---

[557] Gaberel, *Histoire*, III p. 132.
[558] AEG, RC 169, f. 289. The council entry reads: "Lettre de Messrs. Les Cantons Magnifiques Suisses voüe concernant les nouvelles doctrines."
[559] Grohman, "Genevan Reactions," p. 267.
[560] Gaberel, *Histoire*, III p. 133.
[561] W. Rex, *Essays on Pierre Bayle and Religious Controversy* (The Hague, 1965), pp. 138-9.

soon, though, as Turretin would continue to push for universal subscription in the Academy.

As de Budé puts it, "un incident ranima la querelle" when Chouet was appointed as professor of philosophy at the Geneva Academy.[562] Turretin appealed to the Company that they be extremely cautious when beginning their search for a replacement for the recently deceased professor of philosophy, Gaspard Wyss.[563] The Company was already very wary of admitting someone with insufficient orthodoxy who was not "uniforme avec nous dans nos sentiments et esloigné de toutes nouveaute dangerouses."[564] Jean-Robert Chouet was well respected within the company of Geneva, but they knew that he had fully accepted the philosophical system of Descartes. Gaberel writes that "la Compagnie le savait; mais elle ferma les yeux".[565] The Company's keen awareness of Chouet's deviant philosophy, though, is evident in its desire to hold a *Programme* designed for applicants to bid for the Chair, something Chouet was reluctant to do.[566] Chouet's uncle, Louis Tronchin, assured him that no one would dare bid against him, but Chouet pressed his uncle to convince the company to rescind its decision to carry out the *Programme*. Tronchin begrudgingly agreed, and Chouet was eventually elected without dispute as the

---

[562] *Vie Turretini*, p. 152.
[563] "Quelle croyait que ce seroit un bon moyen pour bien pourvoir la charge et pour attire des p[er]sonnes de merite et qu'il servirait a donner tousjours plus de reputation a L'Academie quand on verra qu'on est soigneux de recercher de tous coster des habiles gens pour remplir les charges": AEG, RCP 12, f. 318 (22 January 1669).
[564] *Ibid*.
[565] Gaberel, *Histoire*, III p. 136.
[566] Heyd, *Between Orthodoxy*, pp. 37-54 ("Chouet agreed to come back [to Geneva from Saumur], then, but only if invited by the Genevan Council and its Company of Pastors. He flatly refused to bid for the chair and stand up for a *concours* once more, a step which he considered beneath his dignity as a successful professor of philosophy, and harmful to the reputatution of the Academy in which he served," p. 40).

professor of philosophy.[567] Clearly, Chouet's appointment was a highly disputed one and, perhaps, without the help of his uncle Chouet would not have been approved.

Turretin was still rector during Chouet's tenure and he was called to write the *Programme* Chouet was originally going to have to submit to. "When the Council in early May proposed to elect Chouet without a *concours*, it nevertheless explicitly specified that the conditions drawn up in the *Programme* were still binding on the future professor."[568] The final wording of the *Programme*, written by Turretin, says:

> Vous donc, qui que vous soyez, soit des nôtres, soit des etrangers, qui avez sondé bien avant les secrets d'une véritable et sobre Philosophie, car nous ne voulons point donner de lieu parmi nous à la vaine et trompeuse dont il n'y en a que trop aujourd'hui qui en sont aveuglés, venez à ce combat auquel nous vous invitons. Mais à cette condition que personne ne sera reçu au nombre des combattants qui ne nous ait justifié auparavant par de bons et authentiques témoignages l'honnêteté de sa vie, la pureté de sa doctrine, et qu'il ne nous ait assuré par écrit qu'il est éloigné de tous les nouveaux sentiments qui ne sont reçus ni en cette Eglise ni dans les autres Orthodoxes.[569]

Interestingly, Turretin did not mention any specific philosophy, let alone the prevailing Cartesianism of Chouet; the statement simply guarded against any philosophy that was not 'true and sober.' The reason for this is probably twofold: first, Turretin's original wording was a little stronger, specifically mentioning novel philosophy, but was edited by the Company; second, Turretin fully expected Chouet to subscribe to the 1649 theses.

---

[567] Heyd argues that the Company and Council came to an agreement since the Council was pushing for Chouet's appointment and the Company was looking to elect a new Greek professor. Hoping for a compromise, the two groups approved the other's candidate. Simultaneously, then, the Company approved the election of Chouet and Jean-Jacques Sartoris, who was a member of the Venerable Company already. Heyd also argues that Tronchin was attempting to solidify Amyraldianism's hold in Geneva by proposing Chouet for philosophy and his other nephew Croppet, as professor of Greek. Tronchin was, therefore, only half-successful: *Ibid*., pp. 42-6. The Company of Pastors records the election of Sartoris and Chouet on 7 May 1669 with Turretin in attendance: AEG, RCP 12, f. 352.

[568] Heyd, *Between Orthodoxy*, p. 46.

[569] *Ibid*., p. 47. He cites it from the original found in AEG, PH 3505.

Jean-Jacques Sortoris, newly elected professor of Greek, appears to have had no problem signing the theses, but Chouet, aided by Tronchin and Mestrezat, objected to the conditions.[570] Turretin informed Chouet that in agreeing to the articles of the *Programme* he had agreed to sign the 1649 theses as well.[571] Chouet responded that the requirement should be nullified in his case because the original letter calling him to the position did not mention any requirement like this.[572] Turretin countered that Chouet was required to subscribe to all that was agreed to in the *Programme* as a prerequisite for becoming one of their brethren.[573] One week later, Turretin spoke to Chouet again about signing the theses; this time Chouet flat-out refused. Chouet gave two reasons to the Company: first, he was only a professor of philosophy and, therefore, did not need to subscribe to these types of theses, which only applied to theologians; second, he did not know enough about the controversies to decide adequately on one side or the other.[574] Chouet finished by exhorting the Company to reconsider its stance considering that he left the Academy at Saumur and travelled 150 leagues under what seems like false pretences.

> Qu'il priait la Compagnie de considérer quelle avait fait un traitté avec lui auquel il falait se tenir puisque dans la Lettre qu'on luy avoir escrit a Saumur on luy avais masqué

---

[570] AEG, RCP 12, ff. 390-1.
[571] *Ibid*., f. 440 (10 September 1669), "Mons. le Recteur a rapporté que selon sa charge il a parlé a Mr. Chouet et lui a representé que po[ur] entrer a la Comp[agnie] il faloit qu'il se sousmist aux ordres et notamment qu'il signast les Articles de 1649."
[572] *Ibid*., "A quoy l'edit s'avec des marques de reverence pour la Compagnie a respondra qu'il croyons devoir estre dispensé de cette condition puisque la lettre par laquelle on là fait venir ne porte rien de tel."
[573] *Ibid*., "A esté advisé de faire savoir audit Sr. qu'il est obligé de faire a forme de ce qui esté resolu ci devant et selon toutes les conditions portées par le *Programme* qui ont deu luy estre notre freres."
[574] *Ibid*., f. 442 (17 September 1669), "1º Parce qu'estant simplement Philosophe il ne mettoit pas en ses traittés de ces sortes de matières, et partant prioit la Compagnie de ne l'obliger pas à prononcer sur une chose qui ne se doit traitter que dans l'escole parmi les Théologiens; 2º Qu'il ne s'estoit jamais assez appliqué à cette question pour pouvoir prendre parti et se determiner à l'une ou a l'autre des opinions et qu'ainsi il pouvoit protester en conscience qu'il n'embrassoit point les sentiments de la grâce universelle ni de la non imputation du premier péché d'Adam, non pas qu'il les rejettast non plus que les sentiments opposes, mais parce qu'il n'avoit pas assez estudie ces opinions pour adherer a l'une plustost qu'à l'autre." This quotation is also found in *Université Genève*, p. 410.

> precisement les conditions soubs lesquelles on l'appelais et qu'il avait acceptées suppliant pour ce sujet la Compagnie de s'en tenir a cela sans exiger autres choses de luy n'estant pas raisonables qu'on l'ait degagé d'une Academie cette oui l'estoit et qu'on lui ait fait faire un voyage de 150 lieues et apres cela ne se pas tenir aux conditions qu'on luy avait escrittes mais luy en proposer d'autres qu'il ne peut accepter qu'ainsi pour toutes ces raisons il priait la Compagnie de la dispenser de signer ces Theses en mettant sic sentio.[575]

Chouet was most likely feigning ignorance in this regard, at least when it came to his knowledge of hypothetical universalism and the non-imputation of Adam's sin. Coming directly from Saumur, he would have had excellent knowledge of the theology surrounding this controversy because Saumur was the Academy in which Amyraut was employed when he had begun writing on hypothetical universalism. It is difficult to ascertain whether or not Chouet was also being untruthful in terms of what the original letter entailed, as there remains no record. Though it seems obvious that since Chouet was originally going to bid for the professorship that he would have been required to prove some sort of allegiance to the theology of the Academy, Heyd, on the other hand, argues that Chouet purposefully placed himself outside of the theological controversies of the seventeenth century in order to be seen solely as a philosopher.[576] Chouet may have desired to remain above the theological fracas, but it is doubtful that he would have ever been able to remain ignorant in light of his relationship with two highly polemical academies in the Reformed Tradition and the headquarters of the two opposing views.

---

[575] AEG, RCP 12, f. 442-3.

[576] Heyd's evidence is a letter that Chouet sent to Tronchin in April 1669 where he states, "je voudrais auparavant bien insinuer dans l'esprit du Consiel, qu'il est de la dernière importance pour la chaire de Philosophie d'avoir un homme qui ne se mêle d'autre chose que de cela; que les choses ne peuvent jamais aller bien quand un professeur se mêle d'un autre métier qu'il prend plus à coeur; et en un mot qu'il faut que celui qui remplira la charge soit un homme qui se donne tout entier à cette seule étude.": Heyd, *Between Orthodoxy*, p. 49.

Turretin and the other members of the Venerable Company were convinced enough to allow Chouet to sign a slightly different thesis stating:

> La compagnie l'ayant ouï et estant sorti avec ses parents a esté jugé qu'il seroit dispensé de signer ces theses de la façon susdite seulement qu'on l'obligeoit a signer l'escrit qui contient telles paroles. Je sous signé declare que je n'adhere point aux nouveaux sentiments rejetter par la Venerable Compagnie et notamment a la doctrines de l'universalité de la grâce et de la nonimputation du premier péché d'Adam et je promets que j'enseigneray, lors que les occasions s'en presenteront sur ces matieres suivant l'ancienne tradition de cette Eglise et conformement aux Reiglements de la Venerable Compagnie du 6 Aout 1647 et 1er Juin 1649 et que je n'enseigneray rien au contraire ni en public ni en particulier.[577]

Chouet signed on 17 September 1669 and was welcomed into the faculty at the Academy of Geneva. Turretin's opposition stemmed mostly from his wariness of the doctrines of Saumur, though there is evidence that he was also concerned about Chouet's Cartesianism.[578] Ultimately, Turretin shows here that he was not as 'rigid' as many historians claim him to have been. He was certainly concerned about solidifying orthodoxy within and without the Academy, but he was not unwilling to compromise so long as correct theology was maintained.

It is clear, though, that Turretin soon found the 1649 theses to be inadequate in terms of providing a broad theological consensus for the professors of the Academy. In addition, we have already shown that many other Swiss cities were concerned about the development of Amyrauldianism, Cartesianism, and the continued threat of Catholicism,

---

[577] AEG, RCP 12, f. 443.

[578] For instance, in Turretin's *Locus* on theology, he warns against the improper use of philosophy in theology, especially when, "more new distinctions and phrases than necessary are introduced from philosophy into theology under which (oftentimes) new and dangerous errors lie concealed": Turretin, *Institutes*, I p. 46.

Arminianism, and Socinianism. Turretin's friend and former correspondent Antoine Leger had already suggested as early as 1659 that the various Swiss cantons should develop a national confession that united all the Reformed churches under a single authority.[579] After Leger's death and the appointment of Tronchin to Leger's post, the movement towards a consensus stalled in Geneva. Lucas Gernler of Basel, however, was amongst the Turretin's supporters in Basel who tried to persuade the Venerable Company to condemn hypothetical universalism. Gernler wrote to another supporter, John Henry Heidegger of Zurich, about Switzerland's desire to defend Reformed orthodoxy in Geneva.[580]

In 1669, Gernler and other Reformed theologians and ministers met in Baden, Switzerland, and decided that there was a need for a new Helvetic creed to supplement the previous ones, including the two *Helvetic Confessions* (1536 and 1562) and the *Consensus Tigurinus* (1548). After some conversation and compromise they decided to limit the creed to condemning certain ideas and not individuals. Many within the Reformed community wished to condemn the Dutch theologian Johannes Coccejus (1603-69) who came to be known as a 'federal' or 'covenant' theologian. Klauber summarises Cocceius's thus: "He tended to read typologies throughout the OT and saw its primary value in its reference to Christ. The most controversial stance of Cocceius was his rejection of the Law for the believer which led to a controversy over his belief that the Christian did not have to keep the Sabbath."[581] Ultimately, they chose to omit

---

[579] M. Klauber, "The Helvetic Formula Consensus (1675): An Introduction and Translation," *Trinity Journal*, 11 (1990), p. 109.
[580] Klauber, "Helvetic," p. 109.
[581] *Ibid*., p. 111 (n. 25).

any canons against Covenant theology when the Swiss Evangelic Diet commissioned the writing of the Helvetic Formula Consensus in 1677.[582]

The Company of Pastors of Geneva did not immediately accept the Formula in 1677 and in many ways they were reluctant to receive the Formula at all.[583] In September 1677, the Company decided to hold a debate about it.[584] The deliberations concerned the necessity of another statement, at all. Many believed that their signature to the 1669 articles was more than sufficient and that the subscription of another article was redundant. The debate was very detailed and the Company argued over the proper use of the biblical text. In particular, the opponents of the Formula cited what they believed to be a dubious reading of the Gospel of Matthew and Paul's second letter to Timothy. Needless to say, those who challenged the veracity of Heidegger's interpretations did not do so on simply theological grounds; they dove deeply into his biblical exegesis, looking for ways to discredit the Formula.[585]

Turretin was pitted against his colleagues again, this time in the form of Louis Tronchin and Philippe Mestrezat. Tronchin disliked the Formula for several reasons, though no doubt it was primarily due to his acceptance of Amyrauldianism. "First, they sincerely believed that its articles contradicted both Scripture and good sense. Second, they saw in the Formula a narrowing of the definition of Reformed orthodoxy beyond the views of Calvin and Beza, and the Second Helvetic Confession. Third, they felt that forcing the theological students to sign the articles would divide, rather than strengthen,

---

[582] *Ibid*., p. 111.
[583] M. Klauber, *Between Reformed Scholasticism and Pan-Protestantism: Jean-Alphonse Turretin (1671-1737) and Enlightened Orthodoxy at the Academy of Geneva* (London, 1994), p. 34.
[584] "Touchant la formule du Consensus des Eglises Reformé de Suisse, la Compe. ayant éte convoquée expressement aujourd'hui pour en deliberer, Mr le mod. en a fait la profession.": AEG, RCP 13, f. 615 (21 September 1677).
[585] AEG, RCP 13, ff. 615-7.

the Reformed movement."[586] Ultimately, Turretin would win the immediate victory when, in 1679, the Company of Pastors approved the Formula and it became binding upon those who studied and taught at the Genevan Academy.[587] This victory would be short-lived, however, as Turretin was unknowingly beginning his final years.

It was no doubt in the midst of these deliberations that Turretin decided to embark on his most important work: the *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*. In fact, the first volume was published in Geneva the same year that the Formula was officially adopted, 1679. Years of theological and ecclesiastical turbulence had been enough for Turretin and it seemed that he would have to contribute his own understanding of the Christian faith. It is telling that Turretin entitled this work 'elenctic' theology: that is, theology which refutes dubious interpretations through the use of logic. Though his most influential work, it was not his first foray into the polemics of Early Modern Christianity. Throughout the 1660s and 70s, Turretin would contribute significant works concerning a variety of topics, including: Disputations on the Satisfaction of Christ (1666),[588] the necessity of good works (1673),[589] and on the necessity of seceding from the Roman Church.[590] The content of these works and the *Institutes* will be discussed, at length, in Chapters four and five, but preliminary conclusions show that Turretin was hardly preoccupied with Amyrauldianism or Cartesianism in his theological works. There was a mixture of issues that needed to be dealt with in order to maintain theological purity and to claim that

---

[586] Klauber, *Reformed Scholasticism*, p. 36.
[587] AEG, RCP 13, f. 758 (3 January 1679).
[588] F. Turretin, "De satisfactione Christi disputationes, cum indicibus necessaries. Adjectae sunt ejusdem duae disputationes: (a) De circulo pontificio. (b) De concordia Jacobi et Pauli in articulo justificationis" (Geneva, 1666).
[589] F. Turretin, "De bonorum operum necessitate" (Geneva, 1673).
[590] F. Turretin, "De necessaria secessione nostra ab Ecclesia Romana et impossibili cum ea syncretismo. Accessit ejusdem disputationum miscellanearum decas" (Geneva, 1687).

Turretin was primarily interested in protecting 'rigid' predestination over any other theological locus is historically inaccurate.

In his final years, Turretin finally decided to start a family. Indeed, even Pictet seems to concede that this was a footnote in his life, writing: "It seemed nothing was lacking for him except the highest honor of marriage: and thus he began to think of taking a wife."[591] On 23 September 1669 Turretin married Elizabeth de Masse and together they had four children, though it appears that all but one died in infancy.[592] Finally, Turretin died on 28 September 1687.[593] On 30 September the Company noted his death, writing that his illness was so sudden and violent that they did not have time to say their final farewells. Messieurs Butini and Sarasin were charged with organizing his funeral.[594] The next week the Company received a letter of condolences from Bern and by the end of October Turretin's nephew Benedict Pictet was chosen to replace his uncle as professor of theology.[595] The Company did not consider his death to be a minimal one, but noted that God had caused a deep blow to the Church and Academy by taking Turretin. His only remaining child, Jean-Alphonse, was an adolescent when his father died.

III. Conclusion

Turretin's life, then, is one of deep division, though not necessarily on his part. From the beginning of his ministry in Geneva, Turretin was called upon to address issues

---

[591] Pictet, "Funeral Oration," p. 671.
[592] On 18 August 1670, Benedict (d. 30 April 1671), son of Turretin was baptized. The following year on 17 August 1671 Jean-Alphonse was baptized. On 17 March 1673, Louise (d. 27 July 1673) was baptized. Finally, on 5 June 1676 Turretin's final child, Gabrielle Benedetto (d. 19 August 1680), was baptized. All four children were baptized in the Italian church. Baptisms are recorded in AEG, EC rép. 1.8, f. 255 and 1.9, f. 281; deaths are recorded in AEG, EC Rép 3.5, f. 139 and 3.6, f. 320.
[593] AEG, EC Rép. 3.6, f. 320.
[594] AEG, RCP 16, f. 20.
[595] *Ibid*., ff. 21-2.

surrounding factions within the Reformed community. He was appointed to minister to the church in Lyon, he was asked to find funds for the rebuilding of the walls of *Rome Protestant*, and he was given the opportunity to argue for his understanding of Reformed orthodoxy. It is not surprising, therefore, that he chose to write a theological system centred on detailing the intricacies of Reformed thought. Turretin dedicated his life, in many ways, to attempting to unify divisions fomenting within the Tradition. However, due to the complex and interwoven nature of governance in Geneva, his desire to unify often resulted in further conflict. This chapter has argued, though, that Turretin's context within the situation of Early Modern Geneva placed him in the midst of the continuing disputes. It is in this tumultuous period that the *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* were written and it is where our focus now turns.

Chapter 4: The *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*

Without a doubt, Turretin's most famous work, both during and after his life, was his massive *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*.[596] Dennison refers to the *Institutes* as Turretin's "magnum opus … at once familiar, profound, erudite, thorough and precise."[597] While it is certainly all those things and more, Dennison's analysis of the *Institutes* errs towards hagiography and not sober historical judgment. Dennison is, of course, not the only historian to paint Turretin's work with broad brush strokes, though he is one of the few to have such a positive interpretation of it. I have already discussed Armstrong's dismissive opinion of Reformed Scholasticism and his belief that scholasticism altered Reformed theology to the point that predestination became the "*central dogma*" of post-Calvin Reformed theologians.[598] Armstrong's argument is that Calvin, and following Calvin, Moses Amyraut, produced "analytic and inductive theology," while scholastics, primarily Theodore Beza, introduced a "synthetic and deductive methodology" to Reformed theology.[599] He declares emphatically that "It seems, in fact, clear that the supralapsarian position [of Beza and the scholastics] was taken precisely in order to satisfy the demands of logic."[600] In addition, Eamon Duffy has described the theological environment of Geneva and Switzerland in the seventeenth century as, "locked in the scholastic straight-jacket of the *Formula Consensus*, committed to the infallibility of the medieval pointing

---

[596] The first volume of the *Institutes* was published in 1679, with the two subsequent volumes following in 1682 and 1685, all published in Geneva: J. Dennison, "The Life and Career of Francis Turretin," in *Elenctic Theology*, III p. 646.
[597] Dennison, "Life and Career," III p. 647.
[598] *Amyraut Heresy*, p. 137.
[599] *Ibid*., p. 136.
[600] *Ibid*., p. 137.

of the received text of the Hebrew bible, and to a horrific form of the doctrine of predestination".[601] Clearly Turretin's legacy is one of great division. This chapter seeks to take a historical look at Turretin's *Institutes* as it was received and interpreted *in its time*. In so doing, this chapter will try to reframe the content of Turretin's *Institutes* within its historical context and without any of the modern polemics concerning confessional priorities. It will argue that Turretin's *Institutes* were meant, primarily, to be persuasive, convincing the people of Geneva and the wider Reformed Tradition that his version of orthodoxy stood in line with orthodox Christianity from the apostles to the present day.

I. The Historical Situation

When the first volume of the *Institutes* was published in 1679 it was but one addition to a litany of theological works produced throughout the history of Christianity. The Christian Church began producing theological works within the first hundred years after the original apostles. The inclination for clear, uncompromising delineation of thought pervades the history of the Church. In order to understand the *Institutes* properly, it is necessary to chart the history of theology and ideas from *at least* the late-medieval period through the Reformation. Far too many historical monographs and articles have analysed post-Reformation theology too narrowly, often only interpreting its place within the scope of sixteenth and seventeenth-century theology. It is the contention of this work that the *Institutes*, and other post-Reformation works, are only properly understood by

[601] E. Duffy, "*Correspondence Fraternelle;* The SPCK, the SPG, and the Churches of Switzerland in the War of the Spanish Succession," in D. Baker (ed.), *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c1500-c1750*, Studies in Church History, 2 (Oxford, 1979), p. 251.

recognising their roots in late-medieval thought and tracing it through the Reformation. This will not only help the historian understand the *Institutes*' place in post-Reformation theology, but also in terms of the history of theology as a whole.

i. Late-Medieval Theology

The neglect of late-medieval theology in histories of the Reformation has had some damaging effects to Reformation historiography. Denis Janz says, "If there is one thing that can be called a genuine breakthrough in the last half-century of Reformation studies, it would be the 'discovery' that the Reformation had a background."[602] Janz's humorous quip extends to the historiography of the post-Reformation period. It would, of course, be impossible to explain medieval theology adequately in this chapter; however, it is clear that the *Institutes* have a theological heritage that extends into the late-medieval period that needs to be addressed. Perhaps the two most important theologians, and the two this section will focus on, are Johannes Duns Scotus (d. 1308) and St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274).

Aquinas' theological legacy is now referred to as Thomism and is best explicated in his massive *Summa Theologica*, written from 1264-74. After Aquinas's death in the late thirteenth century, Thomism entered a period of decline, culminating in the expulsion of many Thomists from the University of Paris in 1387.[603] However, Thomism regained much of its former importance in the fifteenth century, on the eve of the Reformation. While Aquinas died two-centuries before the Reformation, his theology set the

[602] D. Janz, "Late Medieval Theology," in D. Bagchi and D. Steinmetz (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 5.
[603] *Ibid*., p. 6.

groundwork for both the reformers and their theological descendants, especially in terms of his theological method. One of Thomism's most prominent components is the use of Aristotelian philosophy. Philosophy has always played an important role in Christian theology and in the early Middle Ages philosophy and theology were indistinguishable.[604] However, unlike the early Christian Church, which dealt mostly with Platonic thought, medieval theologians melded together orthodox theology with Aristotle (384-22 BCE). Aristotle's *corpus* remained relatively unknown in the Latin west until the twelfth century.[605] Beginning in 1100 Aristotle's *Categories* and *On Interpretation* were readily available thanks to the medieval translator Boethius (475/7-525/6).[606] Throughout the next two centuries, Aristotle's work would continue to proliferate as translators produced Latin editions of the *Metaphysics*, *Physics*, and *De Anima*.[607] It was not until later in the thirteenth century that Aquinas commissioned a complete translation of *Politics* and *Metaphysics* and the *Nicomaechean Ethics* was not fully translated until the 1240s.[608]

Arguably, Aristotle's most important and famous work is his *Nicomachean Ethics* (which will now be referred to as EN).[609] EN was intended, according to Bostock, for the politician "to secure the good of the whole community, and so as a preliminary one must

---

[604] G. Graham, "Philosophy," in J. Webster, *et al.* (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Systematic Theology* (Oxford, 2007), p. 512.
[605] Richard Cross refers to Western Europe as an "intellectual backwater" until the twelfth century far surpassed by India, China, and especially the Islamic world. Even Byzantium, in his estimation, was more advanced than the west, philosophically: R. Cross, *The Medieval Christian Philosophers: An Introduction* (New York, NY, 2014), p. 1.
[606] *Ibid*.
[607] There were two editions published of the *Metaphysics*, a partial one from a Greek copy and a complete edition from an Arabic source: *Ibid*., pp. 2-3.
[608] *Ibid*., pp. 3-4.
[609] Bostock comments that EN's "arguments are often better, and it addresses a wider range of problems" than Aristotle's earlier work, *Eudemian Ethics*; D. Bostock, *Aristotles's Ethics* (Oxford, 2000), p. 2.

know what counts as a good life for an individual."[610] Bostock rejects the argument that Aristotle's ethics were purely speculative or, as he puts it, "inexact." Aristotle intended for ethics to be practical, not purely theoretical. They were intended to have an existential impact upon the person, specifically the politician, and exercised throughout the political process to impact the whole. These themes are primary to Aristotle's other works, especially *Politics* which "trespasses on ground that would today be claimed by the disciplines of economics, sociology, and urban planning, as well as by moral philosophy and the theory of education."[611] *Politics*' influence upon Aquinas is immense, though its ideas were always rendered into Christian form, as when Aquinas adopted Aristotle's declaration that humanity is mainly a "political animal"[612], but altered it to add a social dimension, as well.[613]

According to Kristeller, "Thomas Aquinas went farthest among his contemporaries in his attempt to reconcile Aristotelian philosophy and Christian theology, and his writings are distinguished by their clarity and coherence."[614] One of the most fruitful developments of the medieval use of Aristotle in theology was the introduction of *prolegomena* to theology.[615] Prolegomena are conceptual definitions that need to be answered *before* proper theology can begin; as Muller puts it, prolegomena "provide a

---

[610] *Ibid*., p. 5.
[611] C. Lord, *Aristotle's Politics* (Chicago, IL, 2013), p. viii.
[612] This is Aristotle's famous *politikon zōon* definition, which claims that "by *nature* the human being is a" 'political animal': J.M. Cooper, "Political Animals and Civil Friendship," in R. Kraut and S. Skultety (eds), *Aristotle's Politics: Critical Essays* (Lanham, MD, 2005), p. 65.
[613] Sigmund argues that Aquinas produced a "Thomistic Synthesis" in law and politics that "combined tradition, scripture, contemporary practice, and Aristotelian philosophical methods": P. E. Sigmund, "Law and Politics," in N. Kretzmann and E. Stump (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Aquinas* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 218.
[614] P. O. Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic and Humanist Strains* (New York, NY, 1961), p. 32.
[615] Here I am indebted to the work of Richard Muller: see *PRRD*, pp. 53-97.

crucial index to the character and intention of a theological system."[616] For Aquinas, the main question of the prolegomena was, "in what sense is sacred doctrine a science (*scientia*)?" In fact, Aquinas's first question is whether there is anything other than philosophy needed to understand God, as theology, and even God, are subordinate to the highest knowledge; philosophy according to Aristotle in *Metaphysics*.[617] It is in this section that one can understand Aristotle's use in late-medieval theology.

In EN Aristotle distinguishes between several different areas of knowledge. First, Aristotle splits the soul into the rational and irrational; then he splits the rational soul into two further parts, "one by which we survey those kinds of beings, the principles of which cannot subsist otherwise than they do, and the other, by which we survey things of a contingent nature."[618] Of the rational soul there are five virtues: art, science, prudence, wisdom and intellect. EN uses the Greek word ἐπιστεμε (epistēmē) for science, or scientific knowledge. When translated to Latin episteme becomes *scientia*. This *scientia*, according to Aristotle, "is an assent to universals,"[619] a partial knowledge of things that are necessary. It is this knowledge that Aquinas appeals to in the opening questions in *Summa*. However, Aquinas is also not afraid to disagree with Aristotle when necessary. For instance, the first question in *Summa* is "Whether, besides philosophy, any further doctrine is required?" The second objection is stated:

> Further, knowledge can be concerned only with being, for nothing can be known, save what is true; and all that is, is true. But everything that is, is treated of in philosophical science—even God himself; so that there is a part of philosophy called theology, or divine science, as Aristotle

---

[616] *Ibid*., p. 54.
[617] *ST* (London, 1955), I, q. 1, a. 1, ad. 1.
[618] Aristotle, "Nichomachean Ethics," in T. Taylor (ed.), *The Works of Aristotle Volume IV: The Rhetoric, Poetic and Nichomachean Ethics*, Thomas Taylor Series, 22 (6 vols, Frome, 2002), p. 331.
[619] *Ibid*., p. 336.

> has proved (Metaph. vi). Therefore, besides philosophical science, there is no need of any further knowledge.[620]

In his reply, Aquinas states that natural reason is a presupposition for philosophy and, therefore, it is possible that divine science, or revealed theology, could come to the same conclusion as philosophy though they are separate sciences, similar to astronomy and physics both postulating that the world is round.[621] Additionally, Aquinas argues "it is necessary for man's salvation that there should be a knowledge revealed by God besides philosophical science."[622] Again, for Aquinas, these scientific understandings of theology and revealed doctrine were introductory definitions that needed to be established before one could even enter into theological discourse. In Muller's words, "We now have, for the first time in the history of doctrine, a formally defined model for the construction of a body of doctrine beyond the simple discursive presentation of the results of exegesis."[623]

Of course Aquinas was not the only prominent medieval theologian and it is necessary to broaden our scope a bit in order to understand the late-medieval period's impact on Reformed orthodoxy. Johannes Duns Scotus, like Aquinas, utilised Aristotelian philosophy in his theology, though he differed from his Aristotelian contemporaries. Muller claims that though Scotus had a profound effect upon the development of prolegomena in theology, it was to a different degree than Aquinas or

---

[620] *ST*, I, q. 1, a. 1.
[621] Joseph Owens argues that one should not entwine Aquinas and Aristotle too much, as it is clear that Aquinas disagreed with many Aristotelian conclusions, most importantly the eternity of the world. Aquinas's prime mover argument found in *ST*, I, q. 2, a. 3 is juxtaposed against Aristotle's theory that the universe is eternal. See, J. Owens, "Aristotle and Aquinas," in N. Kretzmann and E. Stump (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Aquinas* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 39.
[622] *ST*, I, q. 1, a. 1.
[623] *PRRD*, I p. 59.

even his Franciscan peers. In particular, Muller notes that Scotus's view that theology cannot be "scientia proper" differentiated him greatly from some of his associates and predecessors. Only God is a proper theologian because he is the only one with true knowledge of himself, everything else is theology *in via*.[624] God's knowledge of himself was defined by Scotus as *theologia in se*, or theology in itself. The theology of humanity, limited by the confinements of human logic and divine revelation, was *theologia nostra*.[625] Cross argues that Scotus's definition of theology, though more constricted than modern theologians, offers a more inclusive vision than Aquinas. For instance, he notes that for Aquinas the incorruptibility of the soul can be known naturally, while Scotus believed that this truth can only be known through theology found either in the Bible or Church tradition.[626] Therefore, Aquinas's philosophy of the soul is derived from natural revelation, whereas Scotus's comes from special revelation, whether biblical or of Church Tradition providing a much wider definition of *theologia nostra*.

For Scotus and Aquinas, however, prolegomena *should* be considered aspects of their overall dogmatics. In other words, in defining their understanding of knowledge, faith and theology Aquinas and Scotus are making dogmatic statements. Weber argues:

> However, the attempt to find an approach for dogmatics by relating it to a given general doctrine of being or knowledge or existence already contains in point of fact a substantial dogmatic position. It is impossible to begin in this fashion and then later on to abandon this beginning completely. The history of dogmatics shows that such an approach, instead of being predogmatic, becomes, on the contrary, virtually characteristic for the whole dogmatic scheme which is

[624] It should be noted, though, that Scotus was not alone in this thought, as Muller rightly points out: *Ibid*., I p. 61.
[625] R. Cross, *Duns Scotus* (Oxford, 1999), p. 7.
[626] *Ibid*., p. 8.

> developed. The *starting* point of every dogmatics is implicitly given in its *central* point. There are no real *pro*-legomena to dogmatics.[627]

For Aquinas, theology rests on sacred doctrine as revealed through God himself, not upon pure reason or the ability of humans to "transcend reason."[628] For Scotus, theology was limited in the fact that God cannot be fully known.[629] Therefore, since God is the only true theologian, any theology about God done by humans is, in effect, "restricted" just as the knowledge of who God is is restricted.[630] It is clear, therefore, that the development of prolegomena to theology began in the late-medieval period, primarily with Aquinas and then shifting to Scotus and his contemporaries. This method becomes common amongst the Reformed of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with some notable exceptions.

ii. The Reformers

The instigator of the Reformation, Martin Luther, stands as something of an aberration in the history of theology. Luther never produced what would now be known as a 'systematic theology' or, as Muller would put it, a *loci communes*, or commonplaces.[631] Therefore, it is difficult to understand properly Luther's place within the history of theology. Hendrix states, "That task is exacerbated by the number and variety of Luther's writings. Since no one work of Luther dominates his corpus in the

---

[627] O. Weber, *Foundations of Dogmatics* (2 vols, trans. D. Guder, Grand Rapids, MI, 1981), I p. 5 [his emphases]. Muller concurs with Weber stating "The prolegomena, therefore, provide a crucial index to the character and intention of a theological system.": *PRRD*, I p. 54.
[628] F. Kerr, "Thomas Aquinas," in G. Evans (ed.), *The Medieval Theologians* (Oxford, 2001), p. 210.
[629] *PRRD*, I p. 62.
[630] *Ibid*.
[631] *Ibid*., pp. 65-6.

way that the *Institutes* stand out among the works of John Calvin, the theology of Luther has to be reconstructed from a wealth of sources."[632] Instead, Luther's theology is explicated through sermons, his commentaries on the biblical canon, and other treatises on theological and societal concerns.[633] As Muller notes, Luther stands out as an individualist thinker in the midst of several schools of thought making it difficult to place his theology within a specific methodology.[634] However, to assume that Luther's novel approach to theology was normative for *all* Protestants, or even all Lutherans, is highly problematic. Historians have made this mistake throughout the twentieth century and it has only started to erode in the last thirty years. The historian should not take the one, no matter how influential, and apply his methods to the whole without critical examination of his contemporaries.

Luther's contemporary and, in a way, successor, Philipp Melanchthon (1497-1560) gives the historian a different picture of normative theological method at the time of the Reformation.[635] Melanchthon's pivotal *Loci Communes* makes for a strong representation.[636] Unlike the theological prolegomena found in Aquinas and Scotus, Melanchthon's work establishes a series of theological *loci* that must be worked through in order to produce a competent and comprehensive theological system.[637] Unlike

---

[632] S. Hendrix, "Luther," in D. Bagchi and D. Steinmetz (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 39.
[633] For instance, Luther expounded his views on the papacy in an open letter entitled, *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation concerning the Reform of the Christian Estate* in 1520.
[634] *PRRD*, I pp. 65-6.
[635] It is difficult to place Melanchthon as the proper successor to Luther. First, Melanchthon did not study under Luther, but under his uncle and German humanist, Johannes Reuchlin. Second, many have considered Melanchthon to be 'more Lutheran than Luther himself" or, conversely, "no follower of Luther" at all, illustrating the difficulty of putting Melanchthon, and the Reformation in general, into neat, modern boxes. See, S. Kusukawa, "Melanchthon," in D. Bagchi and D. Steinmetz (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 57.
[636] *Loci Communes* was first published in 1521 in Wittenberg and Basel. It continued to be republished throughout Melanchthon's life as he chose to revise his thought. Kusukawa, "Melanchthon," p. 58.
[637] *PRRD*, I pp. 66-7.

Aquinas, Scotus, and Turretin, Melanchthon was firmly against the use of Aristotelianism in theology. "In this first edition [of *Loci Communes*], Melanchthon's aim was twofold: to list what one ought to look for in the scriptures *and* to show that scholastic theology based on Aristotelian philosophy and distinctions was wrong."[638] What must be remembered, however, is that while Turretin's *Institutes* may not share an appreciation for Aristotelian concepts and conclusions, his *method* stands in the midst of a long history of theological development, including Aristotelians and Humanists, Melanchthon amongst them.

Possibly the most contentious Reformer in the debate about Turretin's *Institutes* is John Calvin. At first glance this may seem to be a strange claim as Turretin was born and raised in post-Calvin Geneva and trained, in part, at Calvin's Academy. However, as I have noted in earlier chapters, historians such as Brian Armstrong have argued that Turretin's lack of appeal to Calvin indicates that he was not a *true* disciple of the Reformer, but rather a distorter.[639] As Beck points out in contrast to Armstrong, it is dangerous to assume that direct attribution of a previous authority is equivalent to legitimate descent. In relation to Melanchthon's impact upon Gisbert Voetius, Beck writes:

> To what extent did Voetius receive or adapt Melanchthonian thinking in his doctrine of God? The answer depends on what one understands by reception or adoption. There are relatively few direct references to Melanchthon, but this is also true with regard to Calvin. If frequent direct positive references were decisive criterion, then one could at most speak about a reception of Aquinas,

---

[638] Kusukawa, "Melanchthon," p. 59. However, Melanchthon's relationship with Aristotle may be more nuanced than this. It is true that he believed the Medieval interpreters of Aristotle had misunderstood him, but he was certainly willing and eager to use Aristotle when necessary and even published a new version of EN in 1527; D. Steinmetz, *Reformers in the Wings: From Geiler von Kaysersberg to Theodore Beza* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 49-51.

[639] See Ch. 1, pp. 17-22.

> Augustine, Aristotle and Suárez. By this criterion, Voetius' contemporaries like Samuel Maresius and Johannes Cocceius would have received almost nothing at all. Thus the mere degree of direct positive references could be hardly the determining criterion. Moreover, historical authorities were read in the seventeenth century still rather straightforward from one's own perspective and not yet from a historical-critical approach.[640]

It is necessary, then, to extend our criterion past the notion of simple attribution and historically analyse how Turretin's *Institutes* stand in correlation to Calvin's.

Much like Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*, Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion* evolved over several years. The first edition came out relatively early in Calvin's ministry in Geneva in 1536, two years *before* he and Farel would be asked to leave. According to Zachman, it was during this time that Calvin came into contact with other continental reformers who helped shape his method. "Calvin was especially impressed by the clear, orderly, and simple plan of teaching that Melanchthon followed in his major theological handbook, the *Loci Communes*."[641] Muller echoes this development, arguing that Calvin's later editions of the *Institutes* shows a "development toward enunciation of presuppositions and principles."[642] By the time Calvin's final edition of the *Institutes* was published in 1559 it carried with it a series of presuppositions including the two-fold knowledge of God and the "identifying [of] scripture as the ground of all true knowledge of God."[643] Though Calvin never utilised Aristotle to the degree that Turretin did, it is clear that Calvin's methodological development stands in clear continuity with Turretin and other post-Reformation Reformed theologians.

---

[640] A. Beck, "Melanchthonian Thought in Gisbertus Voetius' Scholastic Doctrine of God," in M. Wisse, *et al*. (eds), *Scholasticism Reformed: Essays in Honour of Willem J. van Asselt* (Leiden, 2010), p. 126.
[641] R. Zachman, "John Calvin," in C. Lindberg (ed.), *The Reformation Theologians* (Oxford, 2002), p. 187.
[642] *PRRD*, I p. 68.
[643] *Ibid*.

Again, in order not to lapse into the fallacy of assuming a single, monolithic source of Reformed theology in Calvin, it is necessary to expand our analysis to others during and after Calvin's time, finishing with Turretin's direct influencers and theological competitors. In late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century Geneva, the likes of Theodore Beza, Jean Diodati, and Friedrich Spanheim emerge as leading thinkers within the Academy and the wider Reformed world. Re-examining Beza and other influential thinkers in light of the continued development of Reformed thought will help us understand if Hall, Kendall, and Armstrong's "Calvin vs. the Calvinists" thesis holds any historical weight. Again, as noted in the first chapter, these three emphatically argued that, beginning with Theodore Beza, Reformed theology took on a decidedly rigid, predestinarian theology, dominated by the primacy of reason in theology. So far this chapter has shown that the Reformers themselves, Luther and Calvin included, were actually unique amongst their late-medieval and Early Modern peers, not vice-versa. However, it has now become necessary to analyse this argument in detail in order to come to some important conclusions.

For Muller, the development of Reformed theology from a less sophisticated and structured discipline to a subject of intense precision is due to the rise of Protestant academies. He writes:

> The first two generations of Protestant thinkers were fully occupied in establishing exegetically and discursively the basic theological positions of Protestantism. […] In the next two generations, however, that is, in the works of the theologians of the latter third of the sixteenth century, the movement toward institutionalization and toward the disciplined academic teaching of theology is evident.[644]

[644] *PRRD*, I p. 73.

Beza, as the first Rector of the Academy of Geneva, fits this description aptly. In addition, Beza had the unenviable task of being the first defender of the Reformed Tradition. This meant that he did not simply have to construct theology, but he had to do so in a way that identified it as unique amongst its concomitant rivals with solid biblical, traditional, and rational bona fides.[645] Muller makes an even more important point about Beza's work, however: it should not be taken out of context by assuming that it was intended to be used as a *central dogma* for the Reformed Tradition.[646] Muller here is critiquing the nineteenth-century assertion, whether positively or negatively, that Reformed orthodoxy developed an overarching dogmatic locus of predestination.[647] His contention is that Beza's work has been taken out of context in order to provide a framework for all future Reformed theologians. The reality is quite the opposite: the *Tabula* was written in the context of a specific theological polemic without the intention of providing a universal, doctrinal starting point.[648]

In his opening preface to the *Institutes*, Turretin mentions, along with Farel, Viret and Calvin, two theologians for whom he felt "impelled" to write: his uncle, Jean Diodati, and his father, Benedict Turretin.[649] Unfortunately for the historian of early seventeenth-

---

[645] Again, Muller makes the important point that this was not unique to the Reformed Tradition, but extended to Lutheranism and Roman Catholicism, as well; *PRRD*, I p.73.
[646] R. Muller, "The Use and Abuse of a Document: Beza's *Tabula Praedestinationis,* The Bolsec Controversy, and the Origins of Reformed Orthodoxy," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, pp. 33-61.
[647] R. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (Oxford, 2003), p. 63. Primarily this contention argues against the work of H. Heppe, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformirten Kirche Deutschlands, Schriften zur reformirten Theologie* (Elberfeld, 1860); A. Schweitzer, "Die Entwickelung des Moralsystems in der reformirten Kirche," in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 23 (Hamburg, 1850), pp. 5-78, 288-327, 554-80; P. Althaus, *Die Prinzipien der deutschen reformierten Dogmatik im Zeitalter der aristotelischen Scholastik* (Leipzig, 1914); H. Weber, *Der Einfluss der protestantischen Schulphilosophie auf die orthodox-lutherishe Dogmatik* (Leipzig, 1908); and E. Bizer, *Frühorthodoxie und Rationalismus* (Zurich, 1963).
[648] Muller, "Use and Abuse," pp. 34-5.
[649] *Elenctic Theology*, I p. xxxvii.

century theology, Diodati's work primarily deals with Bible translation. Though this is invaluable to the history of the translation of the Bible, it does little to provide any type of systematic context in the seventeenth century.[650] In addition, the known works of Benedict Turretin concern specific problems within Geneva and Europe and do not contain any serious theological system. Therefore, we are confined to the works of Friedrich Spanheim.[651] Spanheim's *Disputationum Theologicarum Syntagma* (1652) will serve as our primary example.[652] Spanheim's prolegomena deal with the nature of theology, much like Aquinas and Scotus. Spanheim writes, "Duplex datur Dei revelation Viatoribus, una sphaera naturae, altera in sphaera gratiae."[653] Revelation is objective in nature, but is subjective in the human conscience and natural revelation cannot bring salvation on its own. Instead, Spanheim argues, "Sola itaque revelatio per Dei verbum peccatoribus in sphaera gratiae exhibita salutaris esse potest, quae et actualem peccati expiationem, et modum ejus, et eam per quem id expiatum, et medium istam expiationem nobis applicandi retegit."[654]

For Spanheim, as with Scotus, knowledge of God is only partial. Spanheim uses the analogy of the sun, which we cannot see fully except what it shows us through light, and this light illuminates the world, so God reveals only that light which he chooses to

---

[650] Though it did provide a topic of debate in the seventeenth century the Jesuit priest Pierre Cotton attacked the Diodati translation necessitating a response from Benedict Turretin. Turretin's response totals over seven hundred pages; B. Turretin, *Défense de la fidelité des traductions de la S. Bible faites à Genève: opposée au livre de Pierre Coton intitulé Genève plagiaire* (Geneva, 1618).

[651] Other works by Benedict Turretin include, *Index librorum prohibitorum et expurgatorum* (Geneva, 1619) and *Recueil des pièces concernants la doctrine et practique romaine sur la deposition des rois et subversion de leur views et estats, qui s'en ensuit: le tout tiré d'actes et escrits authentiques* (Geneva, 1627). For more on Spanheim and his importance in Turretin's life see Ch. 2, pp. 130-3.

[652] F. Spanheim, *Disputationum Theologicarum Syntagma* (2 vols, Geneva, 1652).

[653] "The revelation given by God is twofold to those on the way; one is the sphere of nature, the other the sphere of grace." Spanheim, *Theologicarum*, I p. 5.

[654] "Therefore, only revelation through the Word of God to sinners displayed in the sphere of grace freely presented can have power, sin which is active and has been atoned, and the manner of it, and by whom it was atoned, and the means by which we apply our atonement, he unveils." *Ibid*.

reveal.[655] This light is both arbitrary and free, according to Spanheim, and is given differently depending on the subject: some to the incorruptible, some to the corruptible and some to the renewed (ones).[656] Spanheim appeals to the Apostle Paul when he writes that after the Fall of Man God distributes this light in two ways. First, God kindles an inner light in the mind of humanity. The other is an external light given to all so that none can object. He then cites, St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans as evidence for this assertion. Paul writes, "For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. Ever since the creation of the world his eternal power and divine nature, invisible though they are, have been understood and seen through the things he has made. So they are without excuse."[657] For his Church, however, God gave the Holy Scriptures as his revealed will to corrupted man as both a confirmation of his will and as a direction for the Church.[658] It is clear, therefore, that Spanheim in the mid-seventeenth century was working off the developing late-medieval method of systematic organisation, necessitating a preliminary understanding of the nature of theology itself.

It should come as no surprise to the historian, then, that when Turretin begins to write his system he starts with an examination of *theologia*. Turretin's analysis plunges even farther into the depths of definition by examining whether the word 'theology' is properly

---

[655] "Ut Sol in sphaera sua videri nequit, non suo vitio, sed nostro, verum in iis saltem radiis, quibus et medium et sensoria nostra collustrat: sic nec Deus in luce sua inaccessa, 1 Tim. 6 v. 16. sed in illo saltem lumine, quod à se diffunidit." *Ibid*., I p. 12.

[656] "Ut verò communicatio hujus luminis prorsus arbitraria et gratuita, sic et modus communicationis, simul ec gradus. […] à Deo actum, et aliam hujus luminis dispensationem animadverti in homine integro, aliam in corrupto, aliam in instaurato." *Ibid*.

[657] Romans 1:19-20 NRSV. Spanheim cites these exact verses in *Ibid*.

[658] Lumen quidem duplex communiter omnibus etiam post lapsum Deus affulgere voluit: internum unum, quod in mente hominis Deus accendit: externum alterum, quod extra hominem homini in universi hujus contemplation objecit: Rom 1 v.19, 20 et 2.15. Specialiter verò in Ecclesia sua candelabrum Verbi sui suspendit, per Scripturam sacram, tum naturam suam, tum voluntatem revelando, et ad hominis corrupti instaurationem, et ad instaurati confirmationem, aeque ac directionem Psal. 147.20." *Ibid*.

used in Christian schools.[659] Turretin's argument is that though the word 'theology' does not appear in the Hebrew Bible or the New Testament it is intrinsically implied, much like the words 'trinity,' '*homoousian*,' and 'original sin.' In addition, though the pagans also use 'theology' to connote their understanding of 'false' gods, the Christian likewise appropriates it, but with an understanding of its true meaning. "Just as the word 'God' (which among the Gentiles denoted a false and fictitious god), and the word 'church' (which was applied to a secular assembly) are used in the Scriptures in a sounder sense for the true God and the assembly of the saints [so too] the word 'theology' was (of Greek origin) transferred from the schools of the Gentiles to sacred uses."[660] In essence, Turretin has 'baptised' what were once general and broad terms to denote a specific type of theology, namely a Christian one.

Turretin self-consciously inserts himself, and his theology, into its historical milieu. He traces the interpretation of 'theology' back into its pagan origins with the Greek philosophers Plato and Marcus Varros.[661] Again, though, Turretin is very careful to distinguish between the understanding of the pagan philosophers and the true Christians. In fact, Turretin goes so far as to lump in Roman Catholics, Socinians, Jews and Muslims into the heretical fold. *Theologia* is so precise for him that "although their theology may contain some truth, yet because the greater part is false and the errors fundamental, it is properly called 'false.'"[662] True theology, on the other hand, consists of several parts, first being "infinite and uncreated." This is in the vein of Scotus's theology proper; that

---

[659] His first locus is 'Theology' and his first question is, "Should the word 'theology' be used in Christian schools, and in how many ways can it be understood?" *Elenctic Theology*, I p. 1.
[660] *Ibid*.
[661] *Ibid*., p. 2.
[662] *Ibid*.

is, God's self-understanding, though God has chosen to reveal some aspects of this to his creation. Turretin further defines this theology as archetypal, or the "ultimate pattern for all true theology."[663] In contrast to "infinite theology" is "finite theology"; or, in the words of Scotus, *theologia nostra*, our theology. This aspect of theology encompasses God's revelation in Christ (referred to as "theology of union"), supernatural revelation to angels or the Church ("theology of vision"), or, finally, as that which is revealed to "those who have not yet reached the goal ("theology of revelation)."[664] Broadly, Turretin, and others, refer to *theologia nostra* as "ectypal" or a "category into which all knowledge of God available to finite minds is gathered, with the exception of false theology."[665]

In order to illustrate and elaborate on ectypal theology, Turretin further distinguishes between various categories.[666] The theology of revelation is divided into natural (*naturalem*) and supernatural (*supernaturalem*) revelation; supernatural revelation is subdivided into systematic (*systematicè*) or habitual (*habitualiter*) distinctions; and natural theology can be both innate (*insita*), coming from the internal witness of God, or acquired (*acquisita*), which comes *ex discursu*.[667] These distinctions rely on the underlying framework built by previous theologians. In Spanheim we see an earlier prototype from which Turretin would build. Spanheim argues that *theologiae varia* is

---

[663] R. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1985), pp. 299-300.
[664] *Elenctic Theology*, I pp. 4-5.
[665] Muller, *Latin and Greek Theological Terms*, p. 300. Phillips refers to archetypal theology as "God's own knowledge and love of himself," and ectypal theology as "God [communicating] his wisdom through his salvific revelatory acts": T. R. Phillips, "The Dissolution of Francis Turretin's Vision of *Theologia*: Geneva at the End of the Seventeenth Century," in J. B. Roney and M. Klauber (eds), *The Identity of Geneva: The Christian Commonwealth, 1564-1864* (London, 1998), p. 79.
[666] Turretin does not deal with archetypal theology to the same degree as it is the more speculative of the two, dealing with God as he is "the object known, the knowledge, and the knower." *Elenctic Theology*, I p. 4.
[667] *Ibid*., p. 5. The terms in parenthesis are the latin terms used in F. Turrettino, *Institutio Theologiae Elencticae* (3 vols, Geneva, 1679), I Q.II.VII.

divided several ways: into 1. *Theoreticam et Practicam*; 2. *Didacticam et Elencticam vel Polemicam*; 3. *In Positivam et Casuisticam*; 4. *In Catecheticam vel Initialem et Provectam*; 5. *In Noeticam et Dianoeticam*; 6. *In Expressam et Illatam*; and 7. *In doctrinam veride Deo sensus, et in doctrinam de vero ejus cultu*.[668] Spanheim builds upon Scotus's original prolegomena concerning *theologia in se* and *theologia nostra* and upon Aquinas's locus concerning sacred doctrine. Therefore, Turretin's *Institutes* stand in clear continuity with several Medieval and Early Modern theologians. Of course, as any theologian would, Turretin inserts his own understanding based upon his presuppositions and historical context. However, one cannot claim that the *Institutes* are so innovative as to have severed the ties of previous generations, whether Reformed or Catholic.

II. The Purpose of the *Institutes*

Turretin's context within the highly polemical theological world of Early Modern Europe provides us with a strong indication of what the purpose of the *Insitutes* was when Turretin originally wrote it. One can always assume, rightly, that it was intended to provide a well-organised and rational explanation of Reformed orthodoxy. Turretin's decision to title his magnum opus *Institutes of Elenctic Theology,* in which *elenctic* serves to indicate that his theology was going to be grounded in logical argumentation, is certainly evidence of its purpose.[669] However, one great benefit that the historian of the

[668] Spanheim, *Theologicarum*, p. 4.
[669] The Oxford English Dictionary defines '*elenctic*' as: "Of or pertaining to refutation; concerned with refutation; the occupies himself with cross-examination." The importance of cross-examination in the *Insitutes* will emerge later in this chapter. Also, see Ch. 3, p. 173 above.

late-medieval and Early Modern periods has is the dedicatory epistle.[670] Placed at the beginning of the work, usually as a preface, it often provides the reader with a fuller understanding of the nature and intent of the publication. Primarily the dedication was utilised either to thank the patron of the work or to try to persuade a wealthy benefactor to support its publication.[671] Dedications were not limited to theological tracts, either; political works, theatrical texts and even printed sermons usually contain some type of dedication.[672] Turretin's work, emerging in the late-seventeenth century, is no exception, as there is a general dedication and a preface for the reader.[673]

What makes Turretin's dedication different from many of the past is that it is meant to be persuasive, but not concerning financial gains. Instead, Turretin intended for his dedication to convince the leaders of Geneva to uphold theological orthodoxy. In fact, it is to the councils of Geneva that Turretin dedicated his work. The dedication begins with a broad doxology concerning God's providence over the Canton of Geneva. "Our Geneva, not shadowy and emblematically but truly, is the city sustained by the hand of God alone; not by human means or assistance."[674] This sustenance from the Lord starts with the broadest aspects of Early Modern Europe moving towards the more specific. For instance, Turretin begins with the acknowledgment that Geneva has maintained its independence and peace in the midst of a continent at war. As a young man, he would no

---

[670] Williams argues that "the humanists [of the Renaissance] unquestionably stimulated the quantity, if not the quality, of literary patronage" after the Middle Ages; F. Williams, *Index of Dedications and Commentary Verses in English Books Before 1641* (London, 1962), p. ix.
[671] R. Ovenden, "Dedication," in M. Suarez and H. Woudhuysen (eds), *The Oxford Companion to the Book* (2 vols, Oxford, 2010), II p. 661.
[672] *Ibid*., pp. 661-2. Williams notes that the addition of dedications in published sermons came much later than other printed works: Williams, *Dedications and Commentary*, p. x.
[673] Turretin signed the dedication of 10 February 1679: *Elenctic Theology*, I p. xxxviii.
[674] *Elenctic Theology*, I p. xxxiv.

doubt have noticed the devastation caused by the Thirty-Years War and he goes into poetic detail about its aftermath:

> For who is not amazed that in those most serious convulsions of almost the whole of Europe in which scarcely any region has been free from war (none of which has not felt its most dreadful effects), yet we thus far almost alone in this corner of the earth enjoying a halcyon peace have remained untouched an unrestrained. Meanwhile others are compelled with deepest grief to behold devastated fields, cities taken and sacked, villages burned, provinces cut off and other lamentable, direful and dreadful concomitants of war. Torn away from their paternal habitations they miserably wander as exiles and stragglers. Under our own vine and fig tree, we tranquilly eat our bread and enjoy the profoundest peace.[675]

In the broadest sense possible, Turretin appeals to God's providence keeping the canton from war with its European neighbours. This general foundation of the providence of God is integral to Turretin's continued argument, which now narrows to the break with Rome at the Reformation.

As a strong evangelical, Turretin views the Reformation as nothing less than the work of God liberating the Church from the blasphemies of the late-medieval papacy. Again, Turretin turns towards the poetic and, often, biblical for inspiration. God through the Reformation "triumphed" over error, superstition, false idols and darkness, overthrowing the Antichrist in Rome in favour of the ideals of the Reformers. The key statement for Turretin's dedication, though, and what indicates his rhetorical point, is his understanding of Geneva as standing in direct lineage with the Reformation. He writes, "But in this respect [Geneva] is most especially happy—that by the special favour of God she always enjoys the wonderful privilege of the Reformation and has preserved thus far unimpaired

---

[675] *Ibid*., p. xxxiii.

the most precious of religion committed to her."[676] It is this precious religion that Turretin intends to defend through the *Institutes*, and his desire is that the leaders of the canton understand just how important right religion is.

For Turretin, the Reformed orthodox's closest analogue with Geneva is liberty; liberty from European governments and the Roman Papacy. However, liberty is still subordinate to orthodoxy; liberty is nothing unless it is regulated by the proper understanding of God's Will. It is a paradox that Turretin seeks to exploit. In the late 1670s Turretin, Heideggar and Gernler had published the *Helvetic Formula Consensus*, a highly controversial and polemical document.[677] In addition, Louis Tronchin and Philippe Mestrezat had firmly solidified their places within the faculty at the Genevan Academy.[678] Turretin, being clearly on the opposite side of the theological debate concerning the *Formula*, is no doubt appealing to both authority and tradition in his petition to the Genevan councils. Liberty, in a sense, cannot exist without pure theology. If theology is not unadulterated, then it is limited by "the contagion of errors."[679] In a not-too-subtle connection, Turretin inserts a section about previous heresies surrounding the Reformation. Detailing not only the Roman Catholic church, but also several Protestant divisions, Turretin then appeals directly to the councils, writing "These the authority of your predecessors firmly restrained and happily put to flight, so that always with great praise, they approved themselves to be 'strenuous and hearty defenders of the cause of piety,' the honourable utterance which that most distinguished man of God,

---

[676] *Ibid*., p. xxxiv.
[677] See Ch. 1, pp. 67-8.
[678] *Ibid*.
[679] *Elenctic Theology*, I p. xxxiv.

Calvin, formerly used concerning them."[680] Here Turretin provides his most important exhortation, "That this is also your principal care, most watchful fathers of your country, your zeal and piety do not suffer us to doubt."[681]

Turretin does not only attack the theological heresies emerging in Geneva, but also the problem of oligarchy. As illustrated in the second chapter, Geneva's councils were controlled by only a few aristocratic families. Turretin is aware of this problem and the problem of authority in Geneva. He reminds the council, quite boldly, that without the ultimate authority of God as revealed in the Holy Scriptures they would have nothing. Turretin, however, constructs his argument through complimenting them on their exemplary work so far. "This has been accomplished thus far by you that not only has religion remained here uncontaminated by any corruption of error and superstition through the special favour of God, but nothing besides has been changed in the purer doctrine once received here, which you have bound yourselves always religiously to be retained."[682] It is only through God's special favour that these people have been granted the authority to rule over the canton, but only through constant "vigilance" can these rulers protect pure religion. Turretin understands that these select men will control Geneva's future; for him, then, the prosperity of the city sits on their shoulders. They have been given a holy duty to protect its liberty, which was fought for by their predecessors.

Growing even narrower, Turretin then sets his sights on the ministers of Geneva. This even more selective body has a ministerial lineage leading back to Viret, Farel, and

---

[680] *Ibid*., p. xxxv.
[681] *Ibid*.
[682] *Ibid*.

Calvin. Like his appeal to the councils, Turretin argues that pastoral purity of the ministers has a clear ancestry through the Reformers to those who protected orthodoxy against "impure babblings" and "erroneous teaching."[683] Turretin, again, rests his case on authority and emphatically states that "I can solemnly testify before God that no other object was ever proposed to me than that I might always follow my predecessors."[684] This orthodoxy, much like the apostolic witness within the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, has been passed down from the Reformers, though each person has used their individual talents to convey a unified message of salvation. Turretin's final point is that this work is not intended solely for the academy, though it is true that that was its original intention. Instead, he commends this work to all people so that those in the general public will be able to refute adequately the demands of their "adversaries."

It is here, at the end of his dedication, that he makes his appeal for patronage. He has spent considerable time illustrating the need for orthodoxy within the city and, indeed, he has attempted to solidify his place amongst the defenders of Geneva. In strong rhetorical fashion, Turretin has appealed to those within the ruling ranks of Geneva that publishing this work will contribute to Geneva's defence—not only theologically, but politically as well. Since only true orthodoxy can please God, and only God can protect and sustain the city, a strong orthodox voice amongst the heretics will assure Geneva's survival. Again, it is clear that Turretin's intention is to unite Geneva under orthodoxy and not to bind it to some 'unreasonable' theology. In Turretin's estimation, he is standing in a long line of theologians intent on preserving the pure word of God. For him, orthodoxy is not just a theological position, but a political one that could have drastic consequences for

---

[683] *Ibid*., p. xxxvi.
[684] *Ibid*.

those who stray. Turretin's purpose, then, was far different to that claimed by many historians.

In his preface to the reader, Turretin turns towards humility, indicating that it was never his intention to publish the *Institutes*. The original purpose of this *opella* (bit of labour), as Turretin called it, was to present and resolve many of the πρῶτον ψεῦδος (primary falsehoods) of his theological "opponents" which have dotted the landscape of Christian Europe.[685] It was only after the threat of publication by a third party that Turretin consented to print the work, but only if he was able to expand and edit it to his liking. However, Turretin plainly states that it was never his intention to produce "a full and accurate system of theology."[686] Rather, his desire was to present the arguments of the "controversies" that continue "miserably [to] lacerate the church of the Lord."[687] Turretin even explains that he went to great lengths to be as charitable as possible, writing, "I have given attention to this above all things, that discarding everything irrelevant I might diligently bring out and explain as far as possible the state and main hinge of the questions according to the opinion of the parties."[688] Following on, he makes his limitations clear by stating that he is only addressing those questions which are fashionably popular and/or those which contain meaningful objections. Turretin is happy to acknowledge that there are several unorthodox opinions that he sees as too "inane and jejune" for his time.[689] The litmus test for Turretin is the age of the belief. Unlike many historians, Turretin did not forget that the Reformation had a past; rather, he states, "For

---

[685] *Elenctic Theology*, I p. xxxix; Turrettino, *Theologiae Elencticae*, I sig. [¶¶¶1r].
[686] *Elenctic Theology*, I p. xl.
[687] *Ibid*.
[688] *Ibid*.
[689] *Ibid*., p. xli.

since each of the oldest things is most true [sic], no description of better stamp can be given especially in sacred argument than that something has less novelty. Old is best here and that which goes back to earliest antiquity."[690]

It becomes increasing clear, then, that Turretin firmly places himself and the *Institutes* amongst the orthodox theologians extending past the Reformation and the Middle Ages and into the era of the original apostles. For Turretin, to assume that innovation equals progress is a grave mistake. Progress must be made in light of the past; with the opinions of the earliest apostles and theologians as primary influencers. However, all this must be tempered in light of Scripture. Turretin even exhorts his readers to disregard anything that he has written if it is not congruent with Scripture or their rule of faith; in fact, it should be "stricken out." Perhaps the intention and purpose of the *Institutes* is best summed up by Turretin himself:

> Let other books, then, be commended by their novelty. I do not want this statement to justify mine. I avoided it most diligently lest it should contain anything new, a stranger from the word of God and from the public forms received in our churches, and nothing is built up there that is not confirmed by the vote of our most proven theologians of highest reputation.[691]

III. The Method

Of all the debates surrounding post-Reformation history and theology, none is as contentious as the one over the use of scholasticism. This dislike of scholasticism led one twentieth-century historian to claim that scholars should "deplore" the methods used by the scholastics, while not necessarily dismissing their conclusions.[692] This perspective

---

[690] *Ibid*.
[691] *Ibid*., p. xlii.
[692] A. Schmidt, *John Calvin and the Calvinist Tradition* (New York, NY, 1960), p. 175.

has led to no less than a modern polemic surrounding the Reformed Tradition and at its core it deals with the question, "what is the Reformed Tradition?" Previous historiography has answered this question as, "those ministers and theologians who agreed with Calvin in both style and substance." This answer, of course, presupposes that traditions are static and any deviation, no matter how small, results in a corruption of the original intent. Thus, R.T. Kendall writes concerning the English Divine and Reformed theologian William Perkins (1558-1602):

> Perkins's main problem apparently was that he could not see that Calvin and Beza were not alike. He may have assumed that Beza was but an extension of Calvin, and that Beza merely stated Calvin's theology better. Perkins's incorporation of the Heidelberg divines into the Bezan scheme was a good match; Ursinus and these men espoused a teaching that cohered well with Beza's thought, but not Calvin's. […] They were too close to their own theological enterprise to have sufficient objectivity to see that they were actually putting new wine into an old wineskin.[693]

Kendall is illustrative of the main problem concerning post-Reformation theology: it had a single, immovable font in John Calvin. This thesis has shown, and will continue to show, that this is not the case and that Kendall has misunderstood the historical context of post-Reformation theology by overestimating Calvin's influence. In fact, the above quotation, if interpreted through the lens of a variegated tradition, shows that Perkins, Beza, and others saw many of the first and second generation Reformers as orthodox Christians whose theology could be appropriated to win the argument. It appears that, in light of recent research, Kendall has proven the exact opposite of what he intended.

---

[693] R. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford, 1979), p. 210.

This brings us back to the original question, however: to what extent does the method affect the conclusions? To answer this, and better understand Turretin's place in the Reformed Tradition, we must understand what scholasticism is. Like later Calvinism in general, scholasticism in Reformed historiography has been in the process of rehabilitation. Without defining scholasticism (other than referring to it as a "restored Aristotelianism") Basil Hall goes on to blame it, Beza and Perkins for the demise of 'Calvinism' as a tradition in its own right. After Beza, "sound learning, *bonae litterae*, could no longer enjoy the freedom and enthusiasm of the thirties of the sixteenth century: the polemic period of Protestant scholasticism now appearing showed less interest in both the classical humanism and the biblical humanism of the earlier period."[694] Hall paints with a very broad brush and does little to illuminate what 'scholasticism' and 'humanism' are, let alone what makes them different from one another. In an attempt to promote an obvious villain, Hall has done little to help the historian understand the development of theology.

It was not until Richard Muller's work, beginning in the 1980s, that scholasticism's reputation began to be re-examined by historians. At its core, scholasticism can be understood as "school practice."[695] In other words, in terms of theology, scholasticism is not a specific interpretation of scripture, but rather a framework for biblical interpretation. The word 'scholastic' comes from the Latin *scholasticus*, or something 'of a school.' Therefore, in the broadest terms scholasticism simply refers to methods taught at the schools of the Medieval and Early Modern periods. This is further exemplified by

---

[694] B. Hall, "Calvin Against the Calvinists," in G. Duffield (ed.), *John Calvin* (Abingdon, 1966), pp. 25-6.
[695] W. Otten, "Medieval Scholasticism: Past, Present, and Future," *Dutch Review of Church History*, 81 (2001), p. 275.

the fact that for many years Aristotelian philosophy, the major aspect implicated in scholasticism during the Reformation, was confined to the philosophy courses in the universities further entrenching scholasticism's identification with academic methods rather than conclusions.[696] Additionally, Aristotle's works were understood not as a way to unify interpretation of philosophy, but rather, "The Aristotelianism of the later Middle Ages was characterized not so much by a common system of ideas as by a common source material, a common terminology, a common set of definitions and problems, and a common method of discussing these problems."[697] Though the re-discovery of Aristotle's *corpus* did not initiate scholasticism as a method,[698] by the late middle ages scholasticism and Aristotelian categories were nearly synonymous.

Scholasticism has had a fairly vague definition in scholarship, usually being described by adjectives intended to portray the method in a certain light. Instead, we will prefer here the definition given by William J. van Asselt: "In fact, 'scholasticism' is a collective noun denoting all scholarly research and instruction carried out according to a certain method, which involves the use of a recurring system of concepts, distinctions, proposition analyses, argumentative strategies and methods of disputation."[699] Additionally, van Asselt draws attention to two important changes in historiography concerning post-Reformation history and theology: first, is that, as noted above, the

---

[696] Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought*, pp. 31-2.
[697] *Ibid*., p. 32. This also helps illustrate why many at the Dutch schools in the seventeenth century rejected Cartesianism: it was a rejection of long-held terms and definitions from which to build: see Ch. 3, pp. 156-9.
[698] Otten, commenting on the work of R.W. Southern, states that Southern argued that scholasticism was an "intellectual development which followed on the heels of early-medieval humanist authors like Anselm." Indeed, Southern believed that Anselm, who lived before the major rediscovery of Aristotle, was the "father of scholasticism": Otten, "Medieval Scholasticism," pp. 282-4; see also: R.W. Southern, *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe* (2 vols, Oxford, 1995, 2001).
[699] W. J. van Asselt, "Protestant Scholasticism: Some Methodological Considerations in the Study of its Development," *Dutch Review of Church History*, 81 (2001), p. 266.

historian cannot ignore the Reformation's roots in and continuation of the Middle Ages. Second, is that one cannot view post-Reformation theology as though it were in a vacuum, initiating a version of Christianity without regard to its broader history.[700] Again, this point is crucial: theologians of the post-Reformation period understood themselves to be amongst the orthodox of all generations leading back to the first apostles and Christ himself. In fact, one of the primary methods in which scholastics attempted to prove their points was to address the history of interpretation throughout the annals of Christianity. Their theology was, therefore, in part historical.

One major thread that was re-examined, beginning with Paul Oskar Kristeller in the 1960s, was the interplay between Plato and Aristotle; as Kristeller puts it, "Historians of Western thought have often expressed the view that the Renaissance was basically the age of Plato, whereas the Middle Ages had been the age of Aristotle."[701] Unlike their lives, in which Plato taught Aristotle, many historians believed that Plato was the philosophical successor to Aristotle, or that at least Plato had re-appeared in the later Middle Ages. Kristeller rightly argues that there simply cannot be a clean break between the scholastic thought of the late Middle Ages and the emerging humanism of the Renaissance. Kristeller points to a few reasons why historians attempted to create an artificial break at the Renaissance: first, he argues that historians forget the forest for the trees. In their attempt to understand the beginnings of Renaissance thought they have

---

[700] *Ibid*., p. 268.

[701] Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought*, p. 24. Kristeller heartily disagrees with this argument, noting that scholasticism continued quite strongly during the Renaissance *and* Platonism had existed forcefully before the Renaissance. Additionally, it is important to explain that Aristotelianism is often identified with scholasticism, while other classical writers, such as Cicero, are commonly attributed to humanism. Van Asselt puts it even more bluntly arguing that nineteenth-century historians portrayed humanism and scholasticism as "diametrically opposed intellectual movements": Van Asselt, "Scholasticism: Methodological Considerations," p. 268.

neglected, either intentionally or not, the undercurrent of continuing late-medieval thought. Second, he states that historians were simply more interested in the new ideas of the Renaissance and not the old-news of the Medieval period. The innovative thought eclipsed the historic. Finally, Kristeller notes that historians were overly sympathetic towards non-Aristotelians, preferring to portray Renaissance thought as inventive while scholasticism was deemed old-fashioned.[702]

This misunderstanding of scholasticism as dated and unimaginative is even found in the thought of Martin Luther. Immediately before publishing his *95 Theses*, Luther published the *97 Theses*, more appropriately titled the *Disputation against Scholastic Theology*.[703] Throughout this work, Luther rails against many different "scholastic" theologians, never turning away from naming specific writers. In a few instances Luther openly criticises Duns Scotus and Gabriel Biel (1425-95) on various points.[704] Additionally, Luther expresses his dislike of Aristotle in general when he writes in thesis fifty, "Briefly, the whole [of] Aristotle is to theology as darkness is to light. This in opposition to the scholastics."[705] However, one should not overestimate Luther's dislike of scholasticism as Lull points out that Luther's theses were often intentionally provocative in order to elicit an "intellectual challenge" for his students.[706] Two main points can come from this: first, is that Luther's understanding of scholasticism proves

---

[702] Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought*, p. 34.
[703] M. Luther, "Disputation against Scholastic Theology," in T. Lull and W. R. Russell (eds), *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings* (Minneapolis, MN, 1989), pp. 1-7.
[704] For instance, he writes in the sixth thesis, "It is false to state that the will can, by nature, conform to correct precept. This is said in opposition to Scotus and Gabriel" and later in the tenth, "One must concede that the will is not free to strive toward whatever is declared good. This is in opposition to Scotus and Gabriel": *Ibid*., pp. 3-4.
[705] *Ibid*., p. 5.
[706] T. Lull, "Luther the Man," in T. Lull and W. R. Russell (eds), *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings* (Minneapolis, 1989), p. 1.

Kristeller's point that scholasticism was still alive and flourishing in the sixteenth century. This is further illustrated by the fact that Luther was most likely schooled in the *via moderna*[707] of scholastic theology during his studies in Erfurt and at the Augustinian monastery in Wittenberg.[708] Second, is that often opponents to scholasticism, as illustrated in Luther's *97 Theses*, were truly against the interpretations produced by the scholastics and not necessarily against scholasticism itself.[709]

In many ways, the same can be said of Calvin. Unlike Luther, however, Calvin was never trained in scholastic methods.[710] Rather, Calvin's education was centred on the study of law, a primarily humanistic science in the sixteenth century.[711] Like Luther, though, Calvin's thought is not so easily defined. First, Calvin certainly employed philosophic distinctions when necessary. He did not do away with philosophy in interpreting scripture. Steinmetz correctly points to Calvin's use of the fourfold cause of salvation in the third book of the *Institutes of the Christian Religion*.[712] In Calvin's third part of the *Institutes*, titled "The mode of obtaining the grace of Christ," chapter fourteen deals with justification and "in what sense is it progressive?"[713] In his attempt to divorce

---

[707] The *via moderna* was a late-medieval scholastic development commonly referred to as 'nominalism.' Heiko Oberman states the four main developments as such: 1) Words no longer had an *eternal* meaning and were now open to a new *modus loquendi*; 2) Universals were rejected and instead experience became a primary epistemological barometer; 3) The notion of a 'God-who-acts' gave rise to the exploration of final causality; and 4) It gave rise to experimentation as a way of testing experience and challenging the old rules of metaphysics: H. Oberman, "Luther and the *Via Moderna*: The Philosophical Backdrop of the Reformation Breakthrough," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 54 (2003), pp. 650-1.

[708] D. Bagchi, "Sic et Non: Luther and Scholasticism," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, pp. 4-5.

[709] David Bagchi makes this point by illustrating Luther's use of scholastic's distinctions whenever necessary. He writes, "Whether opposing d'Ailly to Aquinas over transubstantiation, or exchanging subtle distinctions of the meanings of 'necessity' with that other avowed enemy of school-theology, Erasmus, or developing the doctrine of ubiquity against sacramentarians, Luther demonstrated that he was able and willing to use the very methods he so execrated in other contexts." *Ibid*., p. 3.

[710] We must also stress that Calvin was not trained in any theological method.

[711] Steinmetz refers to Calvin as an 'autodidact' in terms of the theology he presented. In other words, Steinmetz believes Calvin taught himself the theology that he then passed on: D. Steinmetz, "The Scholastic Calvin," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, p. 16.

[712] Steinmetz, "Scholastic Calvin," p. 25.

[713] *Christian Religion*, pp. 502-15.

justification from good works, Calvin utilises "les Philosophes" when he writes, "Mais si nous regardons les quatre genres de causes que les Philosophes mettent, nous n'en trouverons pas un seul qui convienne aux œuvres, quand il est question de notre salut."[714] For Calvin, these four causes are: the efficient, material, formal (or instrumental), and final.[715] Here, again, Steinmetz correctly notes that this is Aristotelian causality spelt out; Calvin is not shying away from it, but, rather, he is using it to his advantage when it appears that scripture is not plain *enough*.[716] Does Calvin use philosophy to the degree that proper scholastics do? The answer is a resounding "no." However, it would be historically incorrect to say that Calvin or Luther disregarded scholasticism altogether in an attempt to find a pure, biblical religion.[717]

It is true, however, that Calvin often criticised scholastic theologians. In fact, in the same *locus* about the fourfold causality of salvation, Calvin negatively describes their theology. In his 1559 Latin edition Calvin writes, "Quae ad euadendum subterfugia quaerunt hic scholastici, eos non expediunt."[718] A cursory glance would indicate that Calvin is attempting to undermine scholasticism as a whole. However, it is clear from other translations that Calvin is not referring to scholasticism as a method here, but rather to the "schoolmen" at the French universities. In the 1566 French edition of the *Institutes*, "scholastici" is translated as "Sorbonistes." In French, then, the sentence

---

[714] *Idem*, *Institution de la Religion Chrestienne* (4 vols, Geneva, 1566), III p. 522.
[715] *Ibid*.
[716] Steinmetz, "Scholastic Calvin," p. 25.
[717] Muller summarises the issue well when he writes, "In Calvin's case, there is no absolute contradiction between his use of humanistic methods and his appropriation of elements of scholastic theology, nor are his attacks on the scholastics to be taken as creating a clear dichotomy between "humanism" and "scholasticism." R. Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition* (Oxford, 2000), p. 40.
[718] J. Calvino, *Institutio Christianae Religionis* (4 vols, Geneva, 1559), III p. 279: "And what the scholastics here attempt to escape from, they will not be able to disentangle."

reads, "Les subterfuges que cerchent ici les Sorbinistes pour evader, ne les despeschent point."[719] This distinction became necessary as Calvin and Beza often referred to their own students as "scholastici."[720] One can hardly presume that Calvin believed the students at the Academy in Geneva were scholastics in terms of their method. Instead, it is clear that Calvin, at least in this instance, was referring to the instructors and theologians at the universities throughout the Catholic world who had "entangled" themselves in heretical theology, in this case Pelagianism.[721] Therefore, we can see that, like Luther, Calvin's primary issue with the *scholastici* was not their method, but their conclusions. Of course, there were times when Calvin believed that the method could produce tedious arguments, but it would be an overestimation to assume that Calvin would throw the baby out with the bathwater if the method produced, as he saw it, correct theology. Rather, Calvin's understanding of *scholastici* was a polemical one; the schoolmen of Paris were to be condemned not for their method, but for their conclusions.

Perhaps the most pertinent question for our study concerning the relationship between the Reformed Tradition and scholasticism is: what was Turretin's view? Again, if it is true that Turretin and other theologians of the post-Reformation period were in some way beholden to scholastic methods, then it is important to understand how they viewed themselves. In the case of Turretin it becomes very clear that in the *Institutes* he does not view himself as a scholastic in the way that it has been defined by twentieth-century

---

[719] Calvin, *Institution*, III p. 519.
[720] Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, p. 43.
[721] Jon Balserak argues that Calvin "does attribute a genuine value and authority to the living embodiment of the Scripture's truth when it is found in the voice of divinely appointed teachers of the church. He does not reject such a sense of authority, though we are arguing here that he is extremely wary of it, because of Rome's abuse of it." J. Balserak, "The Authority of Scripture and Tradition in Calvin's Lectures on the Prophets", in H. Parish, *et al.* (eds), *The Search for Authority in Reformation Europe* (Farnham, 2014), p. 36.

historians. That is, he was not "much more interested in metaphysics and systematization, and so [was] preserving elements of medieval scholasticism quite in contrast to the humanistically shaped thought of Calvin and Amyraut."[722] Rather, much like his argument in the preface to the *Institues*, the content of theology itself harkens back to centuries of theological orthodoxy in which Turretin believes he firmly stands. We will show that Turretin, then, does not view himself as a 'scholastic' in opposition to 'biblicists' or 'humanists,' but as a member of the orthodox in opposition to heretics.

Turretin's prolegomena spend considerable time defining terms. Being trained in scholastic methods no doubt required that Turretin define his limits before moving onto doctrine proper. This provides the historian in-depth access into the mind of a seventeenth-century Reformed theologian and it allows him to speak for himself. What quickly becomes apparent is that Turretin is ready and willing to defend 'orthodoxy' from anyone who challenges it. In his opening discourse on the nature of theology, Turretin accuses everyone from Plato to Zwingli of holding erroneous views. Plato's error came when he defined theology as either symbolical (as the Egyptians taught it) or philosophical (simply contemplating "divine things").[723] Since Turretin viewed theology as either archetypal or ectypal he made his disagreement with Plato known. Zwingli's error, in Turretin's eyes, was allowing a place for the pre-Christ "distinguished men" in heaven. Turretin writes:

> Zwingli assigned a place in heaven to Hercules, Theseus, Numa, Aristides, Socrates and similar distinguished men, in the letter to Francis I [King of France], prefixed to his Confession of Faith. In this work (after mentioning the saints of the Old and New Testament in his description of the

[722] *Amyraut Heresy*, p. xix.
[723] *Elenctic Theology*, I p. 4.

> heavenly hosts), he adds, 'Here you will see Hercules, Theseus, Socrates, Aristides, Numa, etc. Here you will see your predecessors and as many of your ancestors as have departed this life in faith.' Besides not being approved by us, it is certain that he erred rather in fact than in right, not as if he thought the gate of salvation stood open without Christ and faith, but because he hoped that divine mercy had (in a manner hidden from us, but known to himself) wrought faith in some of those whom he had so illustriously endowed with heroic virtues.[724]

Turretin here illustrates that it is much more important for him to understand doctrine correctly than to be seen amongst important thinkers, whether pagan (as Plato) or Reformed (as Zwingli). What is most important to Turretin is that he is orthodox, not necessarily that he is Reformed.[725]

However, what is most pertinent to our discussion is Turretin's view of scholasticism. In fact, Turretin mentions the scholastics several times throughout his opening *locus* on theology. The first is *quaestio* five, "The Object of Theology: Are God and divine things the objects of theology? We affirm." In section four, Turretin deals with *Deus ut revelatus et foederatus* (God as revealed and covenanted). Here Turretin defines what it means for God to be "set forth as the object." He argues that God is not the object as he is in himself, but only as he has revealed himself to humanity. Rather, he is *Deus noster*, our God, who is "covenanted in Christ as he has revealed himself to us in his word not only as the object of knowledge, but also of worship."[726] He goes on to refute the Thomistic and scholastic idea that God can only be considered in relation to the Godhead (*ratione Deitatis*), which would be deadly to sinners. Here Turretin employs the word *scholastici*, the same word utilised by Calvin one hundred years earlier in the *Institutes of*

---

[724] *Ibid*., p. 15. Turretino, *Theologiae Elencticae*, I p. 15.
[725] This idea will reemerge as we examine Turretin's views on predestination and his disagreement with some "among the Reformed."
[726] *Elenctic Theology*, I p. 16.

the Christian Religion, with a negative connotation. Again, though, he is not attacking the method, but the conclusions, indicating a specific school of thought and not a generalised form of argumentation.

At the beginning of *quaestio* seven (*an Theologia sit Theoretica, an Practica?*), Turretin helps the reader understand who he believes the *scholastici* to be. He writes, "Primi Quaestionem hanc moverunt Scholastici, inter quos diu multúmque jam olim agitata fuit."[727] In his list of *scholastici*, Turretin names Henry of Ghent (1217-93),[728] Durandus (1270/5-1334)[729] and Johannes de Rada (1545-1608)[730] as representatives of the *schola speculativa* (speculative school); Scotus alone represents the *schola practicus*; Bonaventure (1217-74),[731] Albert Magnus (1200-80),[732] and Aegidius Romanus (1243/7-1316)[733] represent the affective or dilective (those who believe theology is neither speculative nor practical), "utpote cujus finis sit charitas;" and, finally, Aquinas himself viewed theology as both, with an emphasis on the speculative.[734] Here Turretin is being neither positive nor negative in his identification of the *scholastici*, simply descriptive.

---

[727] Turretino, *Theologiae Electicae*, I p. 20. "This first question was begun by the Scholastics, between whom some time ago was already agitated greatly for many days."
[728] Ghent was a master of Theology in Paris and a philosopher who, throughout the course of his life, utilised Neoplatonic and Aristotelian thought: see A. S. McGrade, "Henry of Ghent, in A. S. McGrade (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2003), p. 355.
[729] Durandus of St Pourçain was a fourteenth-century theologian most famous for his controversial commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*: I. Iribarren, *Durandus of St Pourcain: A Dominican Theologian in the Shadow of Aquinas* (Oxford, 2005).
[730] de Rada was a Roman Catholic Professor of Theology in Salamanca, Spain.
[731] Bonaventure was a Franciscan and professor of theology in Paris. He was a primary opponent of Thomas's views on Aristotle: A. S. McGrade, "Bonaventure," in A. S. McGrade (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2003), p. 355.
[732] Magnus was also a master at the University of Paris, teacher of Thomas Aquinas, and "the first great interpreter in the Latin West of Aristotle's work in its entirety." *Ibid*., p. 354.
[733] Romanus was an Augustinian and student under Aquinas at Paris: *Ibid*., p. 356. It is not surprising that almost all of the medieval scholastics attended the University of Paris due to the fact that the popes for many years had refused to allow theological faculties at other universities in order to maintain Paris's pre-eminence. This changed dramatically in the fifteenth century alongside the growth of universities in Germany: J. Overfield, *Humanism and Scholasticism in Late Medieval Germany* (Princeton, NJ, 1984), p.12.
[734] *Elenctic Theology*, I p. 20; Turretino, *Theologiae Elencticae*, I p. 20.

However, it illustrates Turretin's wide-ranging view of scholasticism. One of the major attributes that unites all of these theologians is their place within the academic institutions of the Medieval and Early Modern eras.

Finally, in Turretin's penultimate *quaestio*, "An aliquis sit Philosophiae in Theologia usus?" Turretin addresses the *scholastici* twice. First is in regards to taking philosophy to excess in theology. Here Turretin uses *scholastici* in the negative alongside other theologians, including some of the church fathers. He writes, "Some of the fathers, coming out from among the philosophers, still retained some of their erroneous opinions and endeavoured to bring the Gentiles over to Christianity by a mixture of philosophical and theological doctrines: as Justin Martyr, Origen, Clement of Alexandria, and the Scholastics (*scholastici*), whose system is philosophical rather than theological since it depends more upon the reasonings of Aristotle and other philosophers than upon the testimonies of the prophets and apostles."[735] On the opposite side stand those who argue that philosophy has no place in theology, such as the Anabaptists and Weigelians.[736] In contrast to these two positions, Turretin argues that the orthodox (*orthodoxi*) represent a *medium*, or centre, position. Using the biblical analogy of Sarah and Hager, Turretin

[735] *Elenctic Theology*, I p. 44.
[736] Commonly identified with the Radical Reformation, or those reforming groups that did not court magisterial aid, the Anabaptists emerged from the Swiss Reformation and pushed for a stricter understanding of *sola scriptura* than did the Magisterial reformers. The most well-known example of this is their promotion of adult baptism as recognised in the New Testament: W. Packull, "An Introduction to Anabaptist Theology," in D. Bagchi and D. Steinmetz (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 194-6. The less-known Weigelians "[were] developing not only toward antiauthoritarian and anti-war protest themes, but also toward a style of theology that now appears abstruse." A. Weeks, *Valentin Weigel (1533-1588): German Religious Dissenter, Speculative Theorist, and Advocate of Tolerance* (Albany, NY, 2000), p. 183.

proposes that, for the orthodox, philosophy should act as a *serva* of theology; theology is the *Domina* who presides over her *Serva*, philosophy.[737]

The second reference to the *scholastici* is in his section on abuses of philosophy in theology. For Turretin, there are four instances in which theologians abuse their use of philosophy: first is when the truths of philosophy are transferred onto theology (for instance, *ex nihilo, nihil fieri*). Second, when "falsa placita Philosophorum assumuntur," such as Aristotle's assumption of the eternity of the world. Third, is the error of placing philosophy as "magisterium" of the articles of faith. This, according to Turretin, is the mistake the *scholastici* make. He, again, contends that the Scholastics place Aristotle as the arbiter (or, in his words, *in throno collocarunt*) of doctrine instead of the Holy Scriptures.[738] This is also the fault of the Socinians, who deny the Trinity on the grounds that it is rationally absurd. The fourth, and final, error is a subtle reference to the emergence of new philosophical distinctions, probably Cartesianism. He wrote that many abuses can happen "when more new distinctions and phrases than necessary are introduced from philosophy into theology under which (oftentimes) new and dangerous errors lie concealed."[739] The development of Cartesianism in the Academy (as illustrated in Chapter 3)[740] was certainly on Turretin's mind and this could have provoked a blanket condemnation of all "innovations" within the study of theology, as aided by philosophy. Turretin's overall definition of scholasticism, then, is complicated though it can be summed up with two characteristics: first, it primarily relates to the schools of medieval

---

[737] Turretino, *Theologiae Elencticae*, I p. 46. Turretin appeals to both the Church Fathers and the Jewish historian and philosopher Philo of Alexandria for the Sarah/Hagar metaphor.
[738] *Ibid*., I p. 48.
[739] *Elenctic Theology*, I p. 46.
[740] Ch. 3, pp. 156-9.

and Early Modern Catholicism. The prime example of this being Aquinas and subsequent Thomists. Second, the *scholastici* are those who promote philosophy to the master of theology. In contrast to this are the orthodox, who appeal to the biblical witness first, then utilise philosophy as means towards further biblical illumination.

It becomes eminently clear, then, that Turretin, though a scholastic theologian, did not identify as such, primarily. Rather, Turretin self-identified as orthodox and recognised the *scholastici* as an, at times, ally of the orthodox whatever tradition they come from. However, the *scholastici* were not above reproach and they required just as much admonishment as other philosophers and theologians who did not adhere to orthodoxy. Turretin's view, therefore, is that scholasticism in-and-of itself was not orthodox. Instead, scholasticism could be a helpful associate when necessary and when properly trained. Though it would be anachronistic on Turretin's part to assume that the late-medieval theologians should have anticipated the developments of the Reformation, he nonetheless, judges the content of late-medieval and Early Modern theology based upon certain fundamentals drawn from the nature of salvation, scripture, and the Apostles' Creed, in that order.[741] In Turretin's view, when scholastics, whether Roman Catholic or Socinian, attempt to add or subtract from these fundamentals, their methodology ceases to be meaningful.[742]

---

[741] *Elenctic Theology*, I pp. 52-3.

[742] He writes, "When the orthodox sometimes maintain that the fundamental articles are few, this must not be understood absolutely and simply, but both as to the principle heads. Taken collectively, these are few in comparison with the papists (who largely increase them) making the canons of the church, the publicly received dicta of the schools (*scholarum*) and the traditions of the fathers into articles of faith, any departure form which involves one in the guilt of heresy": *Ibid*., I p. 54.

IV. Theology

In order to get an in-depth understanding of the development of theology from the Reformers to the Reformed orthodox, it becomes necessary to re-examine the most problematic locus of theology – predestination – in light of what we have already established. One major disjunction between Calvin and his followers, according to Kendall, was the nature of saving faith. Did Christ die for all or only the elect? Kendall argues that "Fundamental to the doctrine of faith in John Calvin (1509-64) is his belief that Christ died indiscriminately for all men", while for Beza it was fundamental "that Christ died only for the elect."[743] If true, one would assume that Beza was purposefully rejecting Calvin in favour of innovation; it is simply untenable to assume that Beza, a contemporary and friend of Calvin, would not have recognised his departure.[744]

Recent studies have developed the thesis of "continuity and discontinuity" in post-Reformation historical theology.[745] In contrast to the theses developed by Hall and Kendall, Muller and others contend that while there are some differences between the Reformers and the high orthodox, these differences are merely methodological and do not concern the substance of theology. Additionally, they contend, as detailed before, that narrowing the Reformed Tradition's inception to Calvin alone is far too limiting. We cannot take either of these theses at face value, however, and it becomes necessary to

---

[743] Kendall, *English Calvinism*, pp. 13, 29.
[744] This is even more evident in Kendall as he refers to Beza as "Calvin's successor in Geneva": *Ibid*., p. 29.
[745] Richard Muller has written extensively on this subject throughout his career. It is not necessary, therefore, to rehash his arguments other than to say that he believes that the dichotomies between the Reformers and Orthodox were incorrectly drawn and they created an untenable break between the Reformation and the era of High Orthodoxy: see R. Muller, "Calvin and the 'Calvinists': Assessing Continuities and Discontinuities Between the Reformation and Orthodoxy," *Calvin Theological Journal*, 30 (1995), pp. 347-75 and *Ibid.,* 31 (1996), 125-60; Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin,* pp. 39-61; Muller, *After Calvin*, pp. 63-102.

analyse Turretin's theology independently in light of the historical and theological foundation that this thesis has advanced. It is far too ambitious for the present discussion to assume that it can engage with all of Calvin's writing, which encompasses not only the *Institutes* but also commentaries on almost every book of the Old and New Testaments.[746] Therefore, this section will deal only with the 1559 *Institutes*, which constitute Calvin's most well-developed ideas.[747] Being the final edition of the *Institutes* published during his lifetime, it is safe to assume that it represents Calvin's theology most fully. Additionally, this section will examine other Reformed theologians both during Calvin's time and after in order to understand the broad picture of seventeenth-century Reformed thought. Again, this cannot be exhaustive, but it will attempt to survey a wide-ranging opinion of thought throughout the Reformation and post-Reformation periods in order to come to more nuanced conclusions concerning the relationship between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

At the most cursory glance, one can see an immediate difference between Calvin's *Institutes* and Turretin's: the placement of the doctrine of predestination. In Calvin's 1559 *Institutes*, he places his discussion of predestination deep within his third book, *De modo percipiendae Christi gratiae, et qui inde fructus nobis proueniant, et qui effectus*

---

[746] When Calvin died in 1564 he still had several books of the Old Testament on which he did not comment.

[747] Parker brings up an important point in his chapter devoted to "Calvin the Biblical Expositor" that needs to be addressed. He writes, "It is not the purpose of this essay to minimize the *Institutio*—an exercise as obviously ridiculous as Smits' isolating of it. Nor do we wish to overpraise the Commentaries as the only part of Calvin's work worthy of attention. But the Commentaries are, as Richard Hooker perceived, an integral part of Calvin's theological activity." Parker's point is aptly taken and we can assume that the opposite is true concerning my section: it does not intend to isolate the *Institutes* and ignore the Commentaries as though they were illegitimate theological tracts. Instead, because Turretin's *Institutes* are in the same genre as Calvin's *Institutes* they provide a more appropriate analog. See T. H. L. Parker, "Calvin the Biblical Expositor," in G.E. Duffield (ed.), *John Calvin* (Abingdon, 1966), p. 177.

consequantur.[748] Even more specifically, predestination is buried in chapter twenty-one. In contrast, Turretin deals with predestination in his first book as *locus quartus*, immediately following his *locus* on *de Deo uno et trino*.[749] Again, with the most superficial glance one could assume that Turretin preferred predestination due to its prominence within the first book alongside *loci* on Holy Scripture, the Trinity, and Creation. Indeed, some historians have argued just this. Hall writes of Beza, "Something of scholastic formalism can be seen in Beza's work when it is compared with the more dynamic method and vivid style of Calvin. It was Beza who reverted to the medieval scholastic device of placing predestination under the doctrines of God and providence—the position in which St. Thomas Aquinas discussed it—whereas Calvin had placed it eventually and deliberately under the doctrine of salvation."[750] In so doing, according to Hall, Beza reopened the Pandora's Box of theological speculation, something Calvin was adamantly against. Additionally, Beza and Perkins ripped predestination out of the doctrine of Christ and into the doctrine of God, taking it out of Christ's salvific work and placing it into the eternal work of God. Indeed, Kendall argues that Beza was the trailblazer in making predestination the *central dogma* of his theology.[751] If one were to extrapolate their arguments and place them on to Turretin, one could easily argue that next to the nature of theology, the Scriptures and the Trinity, predestination is *the* most important aspect of Turretin's argument. However, Hall actually illuminates the answer to the *central dogma* theory when he raises the issue of Beza's methodological shift back towards scholasticism, as we shall now see.

---

[748] Calvino, *Institutio*, III p. 188.
[749] Turretino, *Theologiae Elencticae*, I p. 329.
[750] Hall, "Calvin Against the Calvinistists," pp. 26-7.
[751] Kendall, *English Calvinism*, pp. 29-30.

The order of Turretin's *Institutes* primarily draws from the *locus* method, wherein each topic is discussed through a series of commonplaces (*loci*). These commonplaces are ordered from the most basic, in his case the *prolegomena* (the nature of theology and the scriptures), to God, creation, salvation, the Church, and the last things.[752] Turretin was not alone in this method, as Muller notes that Peter van Mastricht (1630-1706), a Dutch theologian, ordered his *Theoretico-practica theologia* much the same way.[753] Turretin's explanations differ slightly from both van Mastricht and Calvin, however, in that Turretin begins each *quaestio* within the *locus* with a discussion of what the problem is.[754] Often this involves several different issues and then concludes with a definition of the question. After identifying the question, Turretin moves on to identify sources of explanation, usually starting with the Bible then moving on to other sources. As Muller puts it, "he presents a ranked series of materials, biblical, rational, and traditionary, that he and others have gathered out of a broader study of the subject and its resources, a study that was, itself, not topically arranged in the same sense."[755] The texts, both biblical and historical, are not meant to be taken in isolation from what the reader understands. He is, in other words, presupposing a strong knowledge of biblical exegesis, church tradition, and philosophical thought.[756] This method was consistent with seventeenth-century academic theology. It cannot simply be said that the methods

---

[752] Muller refers to this as a "nominally *a priori* method"—points that build off of one another: Muller, *After Calvin*, p. 58.
[753] *Ibid*. Additionally, van Asselt argues that another of Turretin's possible influences was Gisbert Voetius and his *Syllabus problematum theologicorum* of 1643 which had a similar, academic ordering: W. J. van Asselt, "Scholasticism in the Time of High Orthodoxy (ca. 1620-1700)," in W. J. van Asselt, *et al*. (eds), *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism* (2nd Edition, Grand Rapids, MI, 2011), p. 158.
[754] The "*quaestio*-technique" was developed in the twelfth-century at the theological schools of the late-Middle Ages. This was the primary technique of Peter Lombard in his highly influential *Sentences* (1255-7): J. Marenbon, *Later Medieval Philosophy: An Introduction* (London, 1987), pp. 10-11.
[755] *Ibid*., p. 59.
[756] *Ibid*.

between Calvin and Turretin were at odds; they were simply products of different areas of training and it is clear that Turretin and Calvin were both utilising well-known methodologies that would have not been mutually exclusive.

Looking deeper into the theology of Turretin and Calvin, one sees striking similarities. First, both believed that predestination is a topic important to preaching. God's eternal election should not be confined to merely academic exercises. Calvin and Turretin both believed that since scripture spoke of predestination, the minister would be assuming that his reasoning was wiser than God's to omit it in preaching. Second, Turretin and Calvin hold very strongly to double-predestination: the idea that God elected some to salvation and others to damnation. Calvin writes, "The predestination by which God adopts some to the hope of life, and adjudges other to eternal death, no man who would be thought pious ventures simply to deny."[757] Third is their denial that election to salvation is based upon God's foreknowledge of good works. Calvin and Turretin acknowledge that God knows all things past, present and future, yet both deny that God used his foreknowledge in order to ascertain who would be granted eternal life. To buttress their arguments concerning God's free decision, both Calvin and Turretin point to the story of Jacob and Esau in the book of Genesis in which God chooses Jacob over Esau. This thought is reiterated in the book of Romans when St Paul writes, "Yet, before the twins were born or had done anything good or bad—in order that God's purpose in election might stand: not by works but by him who calls—she was told, 'The older will serve the younger.' Just as it is written, 'Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated.'"[758] They both,

[757] *Christian Religion*, p. 609.
[758] Romans 9:12-13, NIV.

therefore, acknowledge that God's election is, to some degree, arbitrary in that it does not take anything into account other than God's good pleasure.

Investigating deeper, one sees that Calvin and Turretin are lock-step in some of the most important issues surrounding post-Reformation predestination. We have already dispelled the idea that the location of the doctrine is intrinsic to its weight in systematic theology by showing that Calvin and Turretin were largely in agreement on predestination's importance, but now it is important to uncover the more consequential portions of the doctrine in the two theologians. Intrinsic to the arguments put forth by both Hall and Armstrong is that Calvin was much less speculative than his successors, arguing that Calvin even warned against over-contemplating the hidden mysteries of God.[759] It is certainly true that Calvin cautioned the use of too much speculation in theology, yet he was also wary of theologians attempting to minimise God's work writing, "Although their [those who argue against excessive preaching on mysteries] moderation is justly commendable in thinking that such mysteries should be treated with moderation, yet because they keep too far within the proper measure, they have little influence over the human mind, which does not readily allow itself to be curbed."[760] Turretin likewise argues:

> Hence we think that this doctrine should be neither wholly suppressed from a preposterous modesty nor curiously pried into by a rash presumption. Rather it should be

[759] Armstrong writes polemically, "Nevertheless, in spite of such reservations, only the most reluctant can any longer doubt after Kickel's detailed evidence that Beza's whole theological program shows a serious departure from that of Calvin. In particular, Kickel's study lends powerful support to the contention that nowhere is the scholasticizing tendency more apparent in Reformed Protestantism than in the discussions of the doctrine of God. Both Beza and Zanchi had once again placed the celebrated doctrine of predestination in their discussions of the doctrine of God, precisely where it was discussed by St. Thomas Aquinas." *Amyraut Heresy*, pp. 39-40.

[760] *Christian Religion*, p. 608.

> taught soberly and prudently from the word of God so that two dangerous rocks may be avoided: on the one hand, that of "affected ignorance" which wishes to see nothing and blinds itself purposely in things revealed; on the other, that of "unwarrantable curiosity" which busies itself to see and understand everything even in mysteries. […] Against both, we maintain (with the orthodox) that predestination can be taught with profit, provided this is done soberly from the word of God.[761]

This statement, though more longwinded, is nearly identical in sentiment: there are those who err in over speculation and those who err in under speculation. Presupposed in both, and articulated in Turretin's work, is the necessity for scripture to speak on these matters. In other words, both Calvin and Turretin believe that they should speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where it is silent.

The expectation that scripture is the rule of faith is also inherent in both Calvin and Turretin and, arguably, *more* important to Turretin's argument than Calvin's. Turretin's section on the divine decrees and predestination in particular is considerably longer than Calvin's and it is not surprising, therefore, that Turretin deploys more biblical evidence than Calvin does. However, Turretin is much more willing that scripture speak for itself than Calvin is. In fact, one can readily see that Calvin's font for theology was twofold: scripture and St. Augustine. Turretin's preference is scripture alone—though he is willing and able to appeal to tradition, reason and experience, where necessary. For instance, Calvin's argument for why predestination should be taught is centred on desiring to understand God's great mercy. Without properly teaching the doctrine of predestination, one could lapse into the idea that one gains salvation through his works and not through God's good grace alone. The guide in this process of discovery is,

---

[761] *Elenctic Theology*, I p. 329.

naturally, the Holy Scriptures. To deviate from the scriptures in an attempt to understand the doctrine would be to tread far too heavily and to risk "foolish" and "perilous" knowledge. However, Calvin readily admits that the doctrine is found plainly in scripture and that to ignore it would be to ignore what God has chosen to reveal. His sources of explanation come both from the text of the Bible itself—citing the books of Deuteronomy, Proverbs, the Gospel of John and Romans—but also from the advice of St Augustine. Calvin's chapters on predestination (chs. 21-24) appeal to Augustine over thirty times. Calvin's reliance on Augustine is hardly a novel discovery in the study of Calvin, but it does illustrate his limited use of all of Christian history. For Calvin, it is clear that, sometime around the life of Augustine, Christianity was captured by the tyrannical oppression of the Roman pontiff requiring an abandonment of late-medieval theology in Reformed dogmatics. This is certainly different to the way Turretin utilised both scripture and tradition.

Turretin's reasons for teaching predestination are similar to Calvin's, though he is at times more willing to appeal to those outside of Augustine, as when he notes the pre-Augustinian theology of predestination presented by Ambrose, Cyprian and Gregory of Nazianzus.[762] First, Turretin believes that both Christ and the apostles preached predestination. He cites fifteen different examples from the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles and the General Epistles as evidence. He concludes quite pragmatically, "Why did [God] wish to proclaim those things which it would be better not to know? Do we wish to be more prudent than God or to prescribe rules to him?"[763] Second, like Calvin, Turretin believes that one cannot ignore predestination as it is a "primary gospel doctrine and

[762] *Ibid*., I p. 331.
[763] *Ibid*., I p. 330.

foundation of faith."[764] To ignore it would be to ignore the great riches it accords the believer. Finally, Turretin acknowledges that outside forces have compelled that he teach it. "The importunity of the adversaries […] imposes upon us the necessity of handling it so that the truth may be fairly exhibited and freed from the most false and iniquitous criminations of evilly disposed men."[765] Two ideas can be dispelled through this comparison to Calvin: first, it is clear that Turretin appealed to the authority of the Bible as much, if not more, than Calvin. In fact, Calvin's continuous solicitation of Augustine indicates that Calvin may have relied less on scripture alone than historians recognise. Second, it illustrates that Turretin was not as preoccupied with predestination as previous historians have suggested. Calvin's doctrine, though placed later in his *Institutes*, is strikingly similar to Turretin's in terms of content. Additionally, though Turretin believes scripture teaches predestination and that it is a foundational aspect of faith, similarly to Calvin, he recognises the sober judgment needed to understand it properly and the specific situation into which he speaks.

The final aspect we need to analyse in order to discern Turretin's interpretation of predestination is his view of the divine decrees. One of Hall's main contentions concerning Beza's "distortion" of Calvinism is that Beza promoted supralapsarianism where Calvin did not. "Beza taught Supralapsarianism (that is, the view that God decreed from before creation everything relating to man's future, including his fall and total depravity, which comes near to being thoroughgoing determinism) whereas Calvin is not explicit on this point—he would have regarded discussion of it as being impertinently

[764] *Ibid*.
[765] *Ibid*.

precise in setting out God's purposes."[766] A cursory glance at Calvin's doctrine of predestination in the *Institutes* shows that this assertion is *at least* partially false, though one could argue it is thoroughly inaccurate.[767] First, Calvin does not shy away from eternal deterministic language at all in the *Institutes*, writing: "By predestination we mean the eternal decree of God, by which he determined with himself whatever he wished to happen with regard to every man."[768] Later Calvin appeals to Ephesians 1:4-5 which reads, "For he chose us in him before the creation of the world to be holy and blameless in his sight. In love he predestined us for adoption to sonship through Jesus Christ, in accordance with his pleasure and will."[769] In parsing out this verse, Calvin indicates that "before the creation of the world" should not be understood figuratively, arguing, "By saying they were elected before the foundation of the world, he takes away all reference to worth. For what ground of distinction was there between persons who as yet existed not, and in persons who were afterward like them to exist in Adam?"[770] Calvin mentions "before the foundation of the world" several more times in his section on predestination, making it impossible that he would have rejected the Bezean idea that God had determined man's fate before he created them.[771]

In the same way, it is historically inaccurate to refer to Turretin as a "supralapsarian" primarily due to the fact that he claims he is not one in the *Institutes*! One would have to ignore his self-identification or assume he is lying about what he believes to say he is. The final *quaestio* in Turretin's *Institutes* is directed towards various views on the order

---

[766] Hall, "Calvin Against the Calvinists," p. 27.
[767] Muller has done a thorough dismantling of the Calvin v. Beza thesis in: Muller, "Use and Abuse."
[768] *Christian Religion*, p. 610.
[769] NIV
[770] *Christian Religion*, p. 616.
[771] Muller agrees on this point, arguing that Beza most likely received his teaching on the decrees from Calvin: Muller, "Use and Abuse," p. 47.

of the divine decrees.[772] First Turretin elaborates on supralapsarianism. Turretin writes that the order of the decrees in supralapasrianism are: 1) Predestination, 2) Creation, 3) the Fall, 4) and the sending of Christ for salvation.[773] This order, for Turretin, is not immediately repugnant, though he is forced by some considerable objections to reject it. First, by decreeing predestination initially, Turretin believes that supralapsarians have made God's first act one of "hatred."[774] While humanity was still innocent, God rejected some, making hatred instead of love his first act towards mankind. Second, it makes God's wisdom and judgement suspect in that he hates humanity first, then creates them in hatred, then allows them to fall, then shows his love in Christ. It is a backwards order, in Turretin's opinion. Third, it supposes that God is illustrating his justice and mercy in predestination, but Turretin finds this absurd since humanity is neither guilty nor even said to exist yet. Finally, Turretin objects to the idea that God has created humans that he initially intends to destroy, as creation and the fall are post-predestination. Again, Turretin is not wholly against this idea as it preserves God's sovereign power. God is still in control and salvation is still entirely based upon his free decrees, which is an idea Turretin is intending to preserve.

The second example in the *Institutes* is the dreaded Arminianism. He details four subordinate decrees in Arminianism: 1) Sending Christ as mediator and saviour of all mankind; 2) the ordaining of faith and perseverance as a condition of salvation; 3) supplying faith to all of humanity; and 4) ordaining salvation for those who, through his foreknowledge, he saw would come to accept faith and persevere. Needless to say, the

---

[772] *Elenctic Theology*, I pp. 417-30.
[773] *Ibid*., I p. 418.
[774] *Ibid*.

revocation of God's sovereignty over all aspects of salvation is highly contentious for Turretin. His two main objections are first, that God's sovereignty is replaced with human free will and second, it restricts God's good pleasure by requiring free will as a condition of salvation or damnation. Turretin believes that if Arminianism is allowed to stand it will "be discovered to be nothing else than to introduce Pelagianism and papism (newly white-washed) to replace (in the citadel) the idol of free will and to weaken the grace of Christ by a more subtle method indeed."[775] Again, if Turretin objects to anything it is the idea that God's sovereignty can be abrogated by either the free will or logic of his creatures. He concludes, "Since all these things are dangerous (also contrary to what is written and untheological, wholly destroying the gratuitous election of God and erecting again the idol of free will), they have thus far constantly and deservedly been rejected by the orthodox."[776]

The third opinion Turretin gives is that of hypothetical universalism. Here Turretin splits the decrees into two categories: general and particular. The general decree is further split, first in the giving of Christ as a way of salvation followed by the universal calling of all people who have faith in Christ. Likewise, the particular decree is bifurcated first in the giving of faith to the elect and second in saving only the elect. Like supralapsarianism, Turretin gives hypothetical universalism charity in his description, even going so far as to claim that those who believe it are "among the Reformed." He is, however, reluctant to call this a properly Reformed doctrine, noting that in relation to the

[775] *Ibid*., I p. 420.
[776] *Ibid*., I p. 422.

general decrees they "accede to the order of the Remonstrants and are confirmed by almost the same arguments."[777]

Of particular concern for Turretin is the order of the decrees. He objects to hypothetical universalists' order on five grounds, first is that this presents God with an *actual* order of decrees and not, as Turretin would prefer, a simultaneous decree from God's will. The hypothetical universalists are presenting decrees that must be subordinate to one another and cannot happen at once, as God's attributes require. Second, this order puts the means before the ends; it decrees Christ shall come before there is anyone for him to save. Third, Jesus cannot be said to have faith because the decree to send Christ preceded the decree to bestow faith. Therefore, Jesus's faith which is bestowed on the elect is actually a "gift from the Father" and not a "gift from the Son" as scripture implies. Fourth, the decree to call precedes the call to elect, which is logically absurd. Turretin equates this to a person (or God) coming up with the means before the ends. Why is God calling if there is no one to call? Finally, this order causes God's work as Father to be abrogated, making his work in Christ solely the work of God the "lawgiver." In other words, God's work as lawgiver was for all; it was an external means of salvation. However, his work in election is as Father to a few; bestowing all things necessary for salvation upon the elect only. Therefore, Turretin's main disagreement with the universalists is their ordering of the decrees. Due to their necessary subordination to one another, Turretin argues that it makes God's decrees *actually* subordinate and not one simultaneous work of his will. For Turretin, this idea is

[777] *Ibid*., I p. 423. See above Ch. 1, p. 20.

absurd and the order appears to be nonsensical in terms of how a person would act, let alone the omnipotent and sovereign God of the universe.[778]

He concludes his section on the universalists with a point-by-point refutation of why they believe it is a more appealing doctrine than the orthodox view:

> Nor ought it be alleged that it seems better suited: 1. to exalt the goodness of God (for it is not exalted, but rather obscured and diminished, when it is maintained to be vain and inefficacious); 2. to save the verity of the invitation of all men to salvation (for from what has been said before it is evident that its sincerity is self-consistent without universal grace; nor is it founded upon the universality of grace, but upon the economy of the new covenant by which, all external distinction of people being taken away, the Son acquired all nations for himself as an inheritance, i.e., he opens and grants commonly at pleasure the grace of preaching to whatsoever nations and people so that he may gather a church from them); 3. to vindicate the justice of God against the reprobate (for he is always seen to be blameless whether he condemns men on account of sins committed against the law or fully prosecutes them as guilty of unbelief against the gospel; since in both cases [voluntarily sinning], they are the cause of their own destruction, not God); 4. to reconcile the places of Scripture which (now more broadly, then more strictly) speak of the grace of God and the mission of Christ (for the reconciliation is easily accomplished from another source, from the different dispensation of this covenant and the various relations of the covenanted).[779]

It is clear, then, that Turretin views the orthodox understanding of predestination to be superior in every way compared to hypothetical universalism. Having thoroughly torn down their beliefs, Turretin begins to build on the proper Reformed understanding of the divine decrees and predestination.

Finally, Turretin turns to the doctrine "common among the Reformed." In it there is a two-fold nature of decrees, first concerning providence, then predestination. In

---

[778] *Ibid*., I pp. 422-8.
[779] *Ibid*., I p. 428.

providence, God displays his glory first in his creation of man, then in his allowing the fall. In predestination, God begins by electing and reprobating, then follows with the means of salvation. There is, however, an even more specific order of salvation: election, redemption, and calling. Election is an illustration of the Father's justice, redemption is the work of his Son, and calling is the sanctification of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, Turretin invokes God's essence as Trinity in the work of predestination; it is an act of who he is as one God in three persons. In Calvinist fashion, Turretin clarifies that the elect and reprobate come from the same "corrupt mass," indicating that all are deserving of damnation yet God, through his great mercy saves some. He gives three reasons for why this is the preferred doctrine: first, it is most scriptural. He cites several passages in scripture to show that Christ's work was subordinate to election. Second, it puts the ends before the means. God elected before he sent the means for election. Third, "the economical operation of the persons of the holy Trinity in the work of salvation: for as each of them concurs in it according to the mode of working peculiar and proper to himself (the Father by electing, the Son by redeeming and the Holy Spirit by regenerating), so they ought to agree in the object about which they are occupied."[780] Turretin is careful to clarify, though, that this does not mean that there are separate decrees in God. He refers to the desire to separate the decrees as "only with respect to our manner of conception."[781] For God there is only one decree, made in perpetuity through a pure act of will. Turretin finally concludes simply by noting that this is the proper understanding of predestination, intended so that no man may be made to feel in torment for his salvation nor that he would feel free to sin liberally.

---

[780] *Ibid*., I p. 430.
[781] *Ibid*.

V. Conclusion

This chapter, then, has argued for a few different positions. First, is that the *Institutes* was intended to persuade the leaders of Geneva to rule in favour of orthodox Reformed theology. Turretin's argument is based upon the history of the Reformation; they stand in continuity with the Reformers who risked much to gain independence from corrupt theology and governments. Second, the theology of Calvin and Turretin should not be viewed through the lens of methodology. Clearly they were both implementing methods that were in favour during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Furthermore, both speak out against the scholastics in reference to the Catholic theologians throughout the Early Modern world. The term *scholastici* is not intended to denote methodology, but specific people and faculties. Finally, it is clear that Turretin's theology is grounded upon scripture, tradition and reason, in that order. He believed that scripture was meant to be the primary source for theology and often went against prevailing norms if scripture could give sufficient witness. Turretin was one amongst the Reformed and he believed that his theology, and in this instance the doctrine of predestination, stood in unity with those orthodox theologians who came before. In all things, Turretin hoped that his theology would give glory to God, according to his good pleasure.

Chapter 5: Turretin's Writings

Turretin, much like Calvin before him, has suffered from a severe lack of scholarly inquiry concerning his writings other than the *Institutes*. Turretin's other polemical disputations and, most egregiously, his sermons, have been entirely ignored. Again, like Calvin, Turretin was simultaneously a professor at the Academy and a minister to the Italian congregation in Geneva. Therefore, there is a significant amount of his preached sermons available for investigation. In particular, two volumes of sermons were published in 1676 and 1686, both in French.[782] Just as the scholar cannot ignore the Bible commentaries of Calvin, nor can one ignore the polemical and pastoral work of Turretin. By expanding inquiry into Turretin's published works beyond the *Institutes*, the historian is better able to understand his theology as a whole. The *Institutes*, as shown in the previous chapter, had a specific purpose: to illustrate the Reformed Tradition's place within historic, orthodox Christianity. He, therefore, used exegesis, historical theology, and Aristotelian philosophy to stake his claim. This chapter, then, will be focused on three other categories of Turretin's work. First are his disputations, written primarily in Latin, spanning a few decades.[783] Second, are his published sermons, in French and

---

[782] F. Turrettin, *Sermons sur Divers Passages de l'Ecriture Sainte* (Geneva, 1676), and *Idem*, *Recueil de Sermons sur Divers Textes de L'Ecriture Sainte: Pour l'Etat Present de l'Eglise* (Geneva, 1686). In addition, there is a translated English version of one of Turretin's sermons found in a compendium of polemical tracts: F. Turrettin, *The True Christian Altar and Sacrifice: A Sermon upon Heb. xiii. 10* (London, 1715).

[783] His primary disputations are:
1) De Satisfactione Christi diputationes, cum indicibus necessariis. Adjectae sunt ejusdem duae disputationes: a) De circulo pontificio. b) De Concordia Jacobi et Pauli in articulo justificationis (Geneva, 1666). This was subsequently republished in Geneva in 1691, in Leiden with Turretin's *Institutes* in 1696 and 1701, and in the Scottish edition of the *Institutes* in 1847.
2) *De necessaria secessione nostra ab Ecclesia Romana et impossibili cum ea syncretismo* (Geneva, 1687).
Additionally, Turretin produced ten minor disputations:
1) *De libro vitae* (Geneva, 1667)

Dutch. Finally, we will examine the degree to which Turretin influenced the writing of the *Helvetic Formula Consensus*. In so doing, this chapter will argue that Turretin's use of methodologies differed depending on the task, though his conclusions remain consistent. Though Turretin can be accurately described as "scholastic" in his academic work, this chapter will show that he is able and willing to shed his scholasticism in order to suit the pastoral need.

I. Disputations

Turretin, like many Early Modern theologians, was a writer of disputations. Disputations, in general, were a popular and wide-spread medium for theological polemics. Roddan argues that English Protestants, especially the Reformed, wrote disputations for two reasons. First, was the "need to clarify and defend their position"; second, was the biblical call "to always be ready to give an answer for the hope that you have," as found in 1 Peter 3:15.[784] Indeed, William Costello showed in the 1950s that seventeenth-century Cambridge placed a high value on disputations. He writes:

> In October of 1601, Cecil, an extraordinarily active chancellor, ordered the Vice-Chancellor to see to it that '… all dueties and exercises of learninge be diligently and duely performed accordinge to the Statutes & Orders of the Universitie …' specifiying, '(1) In publique Sermons in S Maries Church. (2) In Lectures and Disputations in

2) *Quae Prior est de Scripturae Sacrae Auctoritate adversus Pontificos* (Geneva, 1671)
3) *Quae Posterior est de Scripturae Sacrae Auctoritate* (Geneva, n.d.)
4) *De bonorum operum necessitate* (Geneva, 1673)
5)*De Tribus Testibus Coelestibus, ex 1 Joann. V, 7* (Geneva, 1674)
6) *De Spiritu, Aqua et Sanguine in terra testantibus, ex 1 Joann. V, 8* (Geneva, 1676)
7) *De Baptismo Nubis et Maris, ex 1 Cor. X, 1, 2* (Geneva, 1677)
8) *De Manna, ex 1 Cor. X, 3* (Geneva, 1678)
9) *De Petro Christo, ex 1 Cor. X, 4* (Geneva, 1681)
10) *De Serpente Aeneo* (Geneva, 1688?).

[784] J. Roddan, "'Dayes of Gall and Wormwood': Public Religious Disputation in England, 1558-1626," University of Nottingham Ph.D. thesis (2012), p. 7.

> publique Schooles. (3) In diligent frequenting the same.' In 1619, King James himself insisted on the status quo: "We commaund that no new erected Lectures or Sermons be permitted … to withdrawe Scholars from their attendance on the exercises of Learning, Lectures, Disputations, Determinations, or Declarations, either publique or private.'[785]

The Cambridge disputation of the early seventeenth century usually consisted of students or tutors debating with one another, either publically or privately, over various matters of philosophy and theology.[786] In fact, it was required of Cambridge undergraduate students to participate either as a defender or objector four times during their education.[787]

Though the disputations at Cambridge were mostly an academic exercise, printed and public disputations were often practically used in order to persuade people to convert to a certain brand of Christianity. Hughes recounts an event in which a parish minister in Cheshire in the seventeenth century visited a member of his congregation in order to convince him that the Quakerism which he had just adopted was a most egregious error. The young man consented not to a private, but to a public disputation, in which the minister believed "we clearly proved against him the following points, by plain scriptures, vindicated from all sophistical evasions, false glosses, and subterfuges."[788] Hughes's greater point is that "the pamphlets and other sources used by modern scholars to discuss the issues that divided English Protestants after 1640 were not themselves the products of detached, study-based academic debate. The points at issue involved fundamental truths about the ways to salvation and the proper relationship between God

---

[785] W. Costello, *The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1958), p. 8.
[786] *Ibid*, p. 14.
[787] *Ibid*, p. 15. Costello goes on to illustrate the various traditions associated with the public and private disputations held at Cambridge.
[788] A. Hughes, "Public Disputations, Pamphlets and Polemic," *History Today*, 41 (1991), p. 27.

and humanity."[789] Disputations, like sermons, therefore, played a primarily public role in religion. Michael Questier makes this same point arguing that the sheer volume and speed with which polemical works were published meant that the everyday person, though not necessarily an expert on complicated theological debates, was familiar with, and interested in, the arguments.[790] Additionally, academics would often "summarise" the background knowledge necessary in order to appeal to the lay reader.[791] Disputations, therefore, were intended to be read by a large audience and not confined to the educated elite only.

There would have been very little difference between the polemical situation in seventeenth-century England and Switzerland. Perhaps Geneva's circumstances would have required even more polemical writings due to the adjacent Catholic kingdom of France and the Lutheran electorates in Germany. The widespread growth of publishing in early modern Europe would have made the various tracts and disputations easily accessible to the citizens of Geneva, and it is, therefore, pertinent to understand what specifically occupied Turretin's time. What was most important or most prevalent in Geneva, and the greater Reformed world, that required a specific rebuttal? Additionally, can we detect whether Turretin's public disputations were highly academic and speculative, as his writings are often portrayed, or do they illustrate the more common seventeenth-century method of distilling important truths into pithy and easily-digested arguments? This is an area of Turretin's work that has been totally ignored and so the

---

[789] *Ibid*, p. 28.
[790] As Questier states it: "The speed with which some tracts were assembled suggests that their writers were offering merely standard responses to equally standard assertions": M. Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580-1625* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 13.
[791] *Ibid*, p. 15.

following analysis will add an important new layer to the history of post-Reformation Reformed theology.

In proper academic fashion, Turretin does not shy away from responding directly to his theological opponents. His two primary disputations, *On the Satisfaction of Christ* and *On the Necessity of our Succession from the Roman Church*,[792] were published with specific respondents in mind. For instance, in the former work, Turretin's headline reads, "*Disputatio Theologica Prima de Satisfactionis Christi Necessitate*. *Respondente Gabriel Demonthouz*, *Genevensi*."[793] All twelve disputations in *De satisfactione* are addressed not to Roman Catholic writers, but rather to various people in the Academy of Geneva. Demonthous, for instance, was a student at the Academy in the 1640s who was elected as one the *Preteurs*[794] by the students[795] and eventually served as a minister in 1658.[796] Therefore, much like in English universities, it is clear that Turretin's disputation on the satisfaction of Christ was partially an exercise in Early Modern education as it was addressed to one of his students, though it was most certainly made available to the wider public.[797]

Similarly to the *Institutes*, Turretin divides each disputation into subsections, each one building upon the last. First, Turretin identifies the nature of the question being

---

[792] Turretin, *De satisfactione Christi disputationes* and *Idem*, *De necessaria secessione nostra ab Ecclesia Romana*.
[793] F. Turrettini, *De Satisfactione Christi Disputationes cum inidicibus necessariis* (Leiden, 1696), p. 1.
[794] A "preteur" was a student elected from the student body to be their representative to the administration. The students first attempted to gain representation in 1606, but were denied by the Company of Pastors. Finally, after several complaints to the Rector and the Company, the students were granted a *prêteur* in 1612: *Université Genève*, I pp. 344-6.
[795] This was also true for some of the other respondents, including David Gerard (1655, 1661), Melchisedec Pinaldus (1656), Benedict Calandrino (1658), and Johanne Melonis (1662): *Ibid*., I p. 645.
[796] H. Heyer, *L'Eglise de Genève: Esquisse Historique de son Organisation suivie de ses Diverses Constitutions de la liste de ses Pasteurs et Professeurs et d'une Table Biographique* (Geneva, 1909), p. 452.
[797] The other disputations are responses to people in other Reformed states: Bern, Zurich, Lausanne, and Metz: see *Ibid*.

asked. For instance, in his seventh disputation in *De Necessaria Secessione*, entitled *Antichristi Demonstratio*, Turretin writes:

> For it is out of the light of the Divine Word that we shall expose their works of darkness, laying claim to the true solution to the mystery of iniquity. That this goal may be attained more satisfactorily, we deem it necessary to prove two critical hypotheses. First, we seek to identify; secondly, we will prove just who it is Scripture points to with an eager finger. To support the first thesis, we will reveal, for all eyes to see, the true marks and characteristics of the Antichrist. Subsequently, we will exhibit their application in their proper context, that the Antichrist may be detected. The former will have to be sought from Scripture, the latter from fulfilled events and experience.[798]

Furthermore, Turretin even adds a small *prolegomena* section, this time on the meaning of the word 'antichrist.' Like many of Turretin's definitions, Antichrist (*Antichristo*) can have two meanings: one general and one specific. The general term refers to anyone who is "pro quovis Christi Adversario, qui quancunque ratione Christo se opponit."[799] As evidence, he utilises 1 John 2:18, which reads "Children, this is the last hour; and just as you heard that antichrist is coming, even now many antichrists have appeared; from this we know that it is the last hour."[800] For Turretin, this text clearly shows that *antichristo* can have a general definition for any opponent of Christ. The specific term, though, is the one that he claims the Roman pontiff demonstrates in his office. This term, however, can denote two aspects of the antichrist: first, is that he is a *hostem*[801] and *Aemulum*[802] of

---

[798] F. Turretin, *Whether it can be Proven that the Pope of Rome is the Antichrist* (trans. K. Bubb, ed. R. Windburn, Forestville, CA, 1999), unpaginated.; F. Turrettino, *Disputatio Septima Sive Antichristi Demonstratio Respondente Marco Werdmyllero Tigurino*, in *Idem*, *De necessaria secessione nostra ab Ecclesia Romana et impossibili cum ea syncretismo* (Geneva, 1687), pp. 169-208.
[799] Turrettino, *Antichristi Demonstratio*, p. 170.
[800] NIV.
[801] Stranger; more commonly, enemy.
[802] Rival.

Christ; second, is that the antichrist is *vicarium*.[803] The Pope, therefore, is not Satan himself, but Satan's representative on earth disguised as Christ's representative. As Turretin puts it, "It is to no other purpose, but that he might attack Christ more easily, that Satan thrusts the Antichrist into the office of Vicar of Christ, thereby disguising him under an outward form of godliness."[804]

Now with a strong foundation, Turretin moves to his argument proper. Initially he appeals to the authority of all Protestants concerning the Pope. He cites the the Bohemian Confession (1535), the Thirty-Nine articles (1563)[805], Second Helvetic Confession (1566), the Belgic Confession (1561), the Second Scots Confession (1581)[806], and the Catholic Bishop Roberto Bellarmine to illustrate Protestantism's universal condemnation of the Pope as the Antichrist. As noted in the previous chapter,[807] the appeal to the greater traditions of Christianity is not unknown to Turretin. He frequently cites Christians outside the Reformed Tradition who add clarity and authority to his argument. However, for any good Protestant, appeal to tradition is not enough; one must present a strong biblical case for his position and Turretin does not disappoint.

Concerning scripture, Turretin points to three attributes that apply to the Pope: place, time and person.[808] Similarly to his definition of Antichrist, Turretin further distinguishes each attribute by specificity: they are either general or specific. For the place, Turretin firmly asserts that the scriptures indicate that the Antichrist would rule in the universal

---

[803] Turrettino, *Antichristi Demonstratio*, p. 170. My translataion: one in place of another. More commonly, vicar.
[804] Turretin, *Pope of Rome is the Antichrist*, n.p.
[805] Which he refers to as the "Anglican Confession."
[806] He simply refers to it as "the Scotch confession": Turretin, *Pope of Rome is the Antichrist*, n.p.
[807] Ch. 4, pp. 210-15.
[808] Locum, tempus, personam: Turretino, *Antichristi Demonstratio*, p. 172.

church as a "usurper, claiming both dominion and absolute rule."[809] For his proof text, Turretin appeals to 2 Thessalonians 2:4, which reads, "He will oppose and will exalt himself over everything that is called God or is worshipped, so that he sets himself up in God's temple, proclaiming himself to be God."[810] This temple cannot mean the Jewish temple, according to Turretin, due to Christ's prophecy in the Gospel of Matthew 24:2 that it would be destroyed. Therefore, Turretin interprets the general place, the *Templum Dei*, as the *Ecclesia Christiana*; the antichrist will not sit in the Jewish Temple, but in the Christian Church.

In the specific sense, Turretin homes in on the Roman Church. He writes:

> When the seat of the Antichrist is said to be the Church, this must not be understood in a general, composite sense, as if by the term *Church* we are to understand it to mean that it is at one and the same time the Church of Christ and Antichrist, which is inconsistent. Rather, we are to understand it in a specific, particular sense, whereby we are to look to a seat which had once been the Church of Christ, but which has now been made the seat of Antichrist. It is stated in this manner by Isaiah (1:21), *the faithful city is now called a* harlot because what had once been faithful became a prostitute through apostasy.[811]

Again, Turretin here illustrates his endorsement of the pre-Reformation Church when he indicates that at one time the Roman Church was the Church of Christ. The Roman Church had not always been a harlot, "verum quum progressu temporis à veritate defecit, et alienam doctrinam induxit, tum desiisse esse Christi Ecclesiam, et factam esse Antichristi sedem dicimus."[812] Harkening to Luther's *On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (1520), Turretin identifies Rome with Babylon. At one time it was the city of

---

[809] Turretin, *Pope of Rome is the Antichrist*, n.p.
[810] NIV.
[811] Turretin, *Pope of Rome is the Antichrist*, n.p.
[812] Turrettino, *Antichristi Demonstratio*, p. 174.

God, but now identifies as Babylon, Sodom and Egypt: Babylon due to its power over all the earth, "Intoxicating [Christians] with the blood of the saints;" Sodom due to its "abominable filthiness"; and Egypt due to its "moral blindness, idolatries and cruelty."[813] As a final nail-in-the-coffin (so to speak), Turretin reminds the reader that the Roman Church daily re-crucifies Christ in the mass, much like the original Romans crucified Jesus.[814]

Similarly, in Turretin's fifth disputation *De Tyrannide Romana*, in response to Renato La Charriere, he identifies three areas that indicate the "*vera Christi Ecclesia*: *Veritate*, *Pietate*, *et Libertate*."[815] First there is *Veritate in Doctrina*, then *Pietate in Cultu*, and finally, *Libertate in Regimine*.[816] Conversely, the *Ecclesia falsa* consists of "Heresi, que Veritatem evertit, Idololatria, que Pietatis et Cultus puritatem corrumpit, et Tyrannide, quae Regiminis suavitatem et libertatem opprimit."[817] Again, Turretin does not simply invent these distinctions; rather, he points to scripture as a guide to the true and false church. He argues that the Spirit of Christ is distinguished by these three characteristics: first, the Spirit of Truth (John 14:17), second, of Holiness (Psalm 51:11), and finally, of Liberty (2 Corinthians 3:17). Likewise, the false church is identified with the Spirit of Falsehood (John 8:44), of Uncleanness (Matthew 12:43) and of Murder (1 John 3:12).[818] If a church is identified as having at least one of these false characteristics then the true

---

[813] Turretin, *Pope of Rome is the Antichrist*, n.p.
[814] *Ibid*., n.p.
[815] F. Turrettino, *Disputatio Quinta: Quae Est de Tyrannide Romana Respondente Renato La Charriere*, in *Idem*, *De necessaria secessione nostra ab Ecclesia Romana et impossibili cum ea syncretismo* (Geneva, 1687), pp. 109-43. Truth, Piety and Liberty.
[816] "Truth in doctrine, piety in Religion, and liberty in guidance": Turrettino, *Tyrannide Romana*, p. 109.
[817] *Ibid*., p. 109. "Heresy, which distorts the truth; Idolatry, which ruins pure piety and religion; and Tyranny, which suppresses sweet freedom of government."
[818] F. Turrettini, *The Tyranny of the Church of Rome* (trans. T. Rankin, London, 1820), p. 47.

Church must secede from the false, but Turretin argues that in the Church of Rome all three are met in one "monstrosum Corpus."[819]

This monstrous body manifests itself through the papal monarchy. Again, Turretin grounds himself in scripture and concludes that there cannot be any warrant from the Word for the Pope's supremacy. He further distinguishes that as Christ is called the head of the body (1 Corinthians 8:6; Ephesians 1:22, 4:1-5), "it is an evident contradiction to suppose, that two monarchs can act either co-ordinately or subordinately in the same kingdom. One body cannot have two heads without being a monster."[820] Anticipating the Catholic response, Turretin addresses the idea that the Pope is the "Prorex" of the King—one who speaks in his stead and with his authority. He invokes the wording of the Roman Church, which refers to the Pope as the "Supreme Head" of the Catholic Church and writes, "For in the first place, when any person speaks of a supreme head, he does not mean to say that that head is superior to itself."[821] How can Christ *and* the Pope be simultaneous supreme heads? One must be subordinate to the other, yet the Roman Church maintains the Pontiff's supremacy over the universal Church. For Turretin, this is a contradiction in terms: one body cannot have co-equal, supreme heads. How would it function?

In sum, what we see in Turretin's disputations, then, is a theology borne out of the academy. In common fashion, these disputations were written in response to arguments emerging from the Academy in Geneva. They were not necessarily polemical texts aimed at competing traditions, but were more likely academic exercises published for the

---

[819] Turretino, *Tyrannide Romana*, p. 110.
[820] Turrettini, *Tyranny of the Church of Rome*, p. 55.
[821] *Ibid*.

encouragement and/or conviction of the Early Modern world.[822] Much like the *Institutes*, Turretin's shorter theological works contain a substantial amount of philosophical and theological distinctions. Just like the *Institutes*, as well, Turretin grounds his theology in biblical exegesis. One cannot claim theological truth if it is in opposition to scripture. Again, though, we see that Turretin does not 'proof text' in the modern sense;[823] rather, he scrutinizes the text and then, when necessary, utilizes common philosophical distinctions in order to strengthen his conclusion. What these prove again, then, is that post-Reformation Reformed theology *does not* subordinate scripture to reason, but instead uses reason to illuminate scripture when necessary.

II. Sermons

The spoken and written sermon has, for the Christian Church, existed for centuries. Some of the earliest instructions on preaching were given by St John Chrysostom (349-407) and Pope Gregory the Great (540-604).[824] However, beginning around the thirteenth century, preaching began to emerge as an art in-and-of itself. Some historians point to the Fourth Lateran Council's decision (1215) to make confession mandatory and the rise of the universities as reasons for the development of thematic sermons.[825] Mandatory confession entailed a detailed understanding of one's sin necessitating more pulpit preaching and the university helped to establish the necessary processes for

---

[822] Of course, due to their publication one would assume that polemics played a part in their distribution.
[823] Proof-texting is when the minister or theologian begins with a desired interpretation and then isolates certain passages of the Bible in order to come to the desired conclusion: J. Reese, "Pitfalls of Prooftexting," *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 13 (1983), p. 121.
[824] G. Kneidel, "*Ars Praedicandi*: Theories and Practice," in P. McCullough, *et al*. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 3-4.
[825] *Ibid*., pp. 9-10. Kneidel does address the historiographical disagreement that some historians have on the relationship between the academy and thematic preaching.

developing a sermon. The early modern thematic sermon involved first, identifying and reading aloud a specific verse of scripture, then, "[structuring] the body of the sermon according to the all-important artistic division of the theme."[826] In addition to the thematic sermon, Kneidel identifies three different preaching theories in the early part of the seventeenth century: 1) the homily—an almost exegetical explanation of a long passage of scripture; 2) the classical oration—accommodating ancient, pagan rhetoric and structure in Christian preaching, and 3) the doctrine-use scheme—reading scripture, exegeting the passage, expanding on the plain meaning, and, finally, applying it correctly to issues in ordinary life.[827]

The training of preachers in Geneva was, sometimes, a difficult task. Karen Maag illustrates that Reformed centres of learning often did not spend adequate time and resources training new preachers, frequently requiring these *proposants* to learn "on the job."[828] Indeed, it was common practice to have the older students of the Academy placed in a rural parish for a short period of time in order to develop their preaching skills. Maag points to the rural parish of Chêne as an example where seventeen different *proposants* were placed for as little as six months between 1602 and 1619 before moving on.[829] Another difficulty Maag notes is the intersection of the academic and pastoral work of the *proposant*. She writes, "In essence, it seemed that the theology students were treating their sermons as academic orations, and not making clear enough distinction

---

[826] *Ibid*., p. 10.
[827] *Ibid*., pp. 6-18.
[828] K. Maag, "Preaching Practice: Reformed Students' Sermons," *Dutch Review of Church History*, 85 (2005), pp. 133-46.
[829] *Ibid*., p. 138. Chêne is an anomaly in Geneva, though, as there are no other rural parishes with that high a turnover. The practice in Chêne came to a halt after 1619, as the minister Pierre Chavannes preached in Chêne for twenty-one years, 1619-1640. After 1640, Chêne's revolving door of preachers ended, and they had only fifteen different ministers for the next sixty years, several of whom served for years at a time: Heyer, *L'Église de Genève*, p. 225.

between the style appropriate for academic discourse and the style suitable for preaching."[830] She points to Dutch theologian Andreas Hyperius (1511-1564) as a prominent influencer of the Reformed Tradition.[831]

Hyperius's manual for preaching, *The Practis of Preaching*, begins with an explication on the two types of preaching: academic and popular.[832] For Hyperius, the academic sermons are meant to be limited to the "assemblies of learned men and young studients somedeale profited in good letters" and the popular "applied to instructe the confused multitude, wherein are very many rude, ignorant and unlearned."[833] Under no circumstances, according to Hyperius, should the academic disputations of the academies overflow into the "spacious temples" of the Protestant churches. Hyperius's argument, in his view, is supported by scripture itself, in which the Prophets, Gospels and portions of Paul's letters represented the "popular" portions and other areas of Paul (especially Romans and 1 Corinthians) and the letter to the Hebrews represented the "academic."[834] What becomes obviously apparent is the distinction between the work of the Academy and the work of the Church. While it would be overly enthusiastic to conclude that the two areas were mutually exclusive, this does show that Protestant scholastics were keenly aware of the division between the academic and the popular and attempted to inculcate the necessary method for each.

---

[830] Maag, "Preaching Practice," p. 143.
[831] Kneidel also identifies Hyperius as a member of the Classical Oration company, who "attempt[ed] to reform, not reject, the classical rhetorical tradition according to Protestantism's scriptural ideals": Kneidel, "Ars Praedicandi," p. 13.
[832] A. Hyperius, *The Practis of Preaching, Otherwise Called the Pathway to the Pulpit* (trans. J. Ludham, London, 1577), p. 1r.
[833] *Ibid*., p. 1r.
[834] *Ibid*., pp. 1v-2r. For a fuller discussion of Hyperius's use of popular and academic, see D. Sinnema, "The Distinction Between Scholastic and Popular: Andreas Hyperius and Reformed Scholasticism," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, pp. 127-43.

Turretin's sermons were, indeed, thematic in nature, homing in on a particular verse (or verses) in the Bible and expanding on it. In fact, of Turretin's two printed volumes of sermons, only two of the twenty-two sermons are based on more than one verse of scripture.[835] Unlike the longer homilies of the medieval period, Turretin's sermons used a passage of scripture as a jumping-off point for a particular theme. One of his most famous sermons, *Le Vray Autel des Chrétiens, ou Sermon sur le Chap. XIII. de Epître de S. Paul aux Hébreux v. 10*, takes as its starting point, "We have an altar from which those who minister at the tabernacle have no right to eat."[836] It is important, though, to understand this solely as a starting-point and not as a straightjacket; it is never Turretin's, or any other Reformed preacher's, intention to adhere *only* to that verse. In fact, Turretin's introduction mentions several different Bible verses (Romans 10:4, Galatians 3:24, Hebrews 10:1), before moving on to natural and ceremonial law of the Pentateuch of the Hebrew Bible.[837] Again, it should not seem out-of-place for Turretin to mention the natural and ceremonial laws in a popular sermon; this was common in the Reformed Tradition.[838] But it is more than a simple theological distinction: the natural and ceremonial laws are intrinsic to his ultimate point:

> It is to discover unto us this Mystery, that the Scripture often ascribes to, and as it were translates into the Christian Religion, whatever was most glorious and considerable in the Law; tho' not with a Design to change the Evangelical Dispensation and transform it into

---

[835] The two are: *Le Triomphe de la Mort, ou Sermon sur le Chap. XV. de la I. Epître de S. Paul aux Corinth. v. 55.56.57* (Geneva, 1676) and *Le Buisson d'Horeb sur Exode Chapitre III. v. 2. 3. 4. 5*. (Geneva, 1686).
[836] NIV.
[837] For a history of some interpretations of the Mosaic law in the Reformation, see P. Avis, "Moses and the Magistrate: A Study in the Rise of Protestant Legalism," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 26 (1975), pp. 149-72.
[838] Ford even notes that Calvin often preached about theological ideas, like the Trinity, without necessarily using theological "jargon": J. Ford, "Preaching in the Reformed Tradition," in L. Taylor (ed.), *Preachers and People in the Reformations and Early Modern Period* (Leiden, 2001), p. 70.

> the Legal, but only to … point out to us in the *Gospel*, the Accomplishment and Truth of the Law.[839]

Similarly to Turretin's academic disputations and the *Institutes*, he starts by defining his terms: what is an altar and what does it mean to be a partaker? In the former, Turretin recognises both a physical and a spiritual altar: the first being the altar of the temple, where the Jews were told to make sacrifices to God, the second being the spiritual altar of Jesus Christ. The altar of the Temple, or, as he describes it, the Altar of Moses, was abrogated in the ministry of Jesus and supplanted with the coming of the New Covenant. Throughout this section, Turretin repeatedly juxtaposes the material altar with the spiritual one. He writes:

> In this Respect it is, that St. Paul frequently opposes the Law of Faith to that of Works; the Circumcision of the Spirit to that of the Flesh; the inward Washing of Regeneration, to the Purifications of the Body; the Propitiation of Grace, to that of the Law; the heavenly, to the Worldly Sanctuary; the spiritual Sacrifices of our Bodies and Souls, to the gross Sacrifice of Beasts; and the Mystical Altar of Jesus Christ, to the Material Altar of Moses; for, says he, We have an Altar.[840]

In typical Turretin fashion, he shows here his aptitude for distinctions, but this time not philosophical or theological ones, rather distinctions in faith. Turretin never descends into deep theological arguments or polemics; instead he expands upon the meaning of the text in a way that would have aided the congregation's understanding of what a Christian altar is.

---

[839] F. Turrettin, *The True Christian Altar and Sacrifice*: *A Sermon upon Heb. xiii. 10* (London, 1715), p. 142.
[840] Turrettin, *Christian Altar*, p. 147.

Underlying Turretin's argument, though, is a strong Christocentrism; a belief that the entirety of the Old and New Testaments witness to God's work through Jesus Christ. As he develops his argument, this centricity becomes increasingly apparent. After defining his terms, Turretin plunges into the Old Testament understanding of the altar, with the foundational understanding that the altar is primarily material before Christ's advent. Turretin appeals to the story of Noah in the book of Genesis and the first mentioning of a physical altar in scripture. Diving into the exegesis of the passage, Turretin notes that God's reaction to Noah's sacrifice was to declare that he would never again flood the earth for man's sake. In this instance, we come to understand Turretin's interpretative lens as he writes, "There needs no great Matter of Commentary to understand, at what this properly points: for who is he, that could deliver us from the Malediction of God and restore us to his Favour? Who could stop the Deluge of Evils, which would otherwise overwhelm us, but only the Lord Jesus, our true Noah."[841] Additionally, Turretin credits Jesus with being our "*grand Josué*, qui ayant remporté la victoire sur le Diable, et sur le Monde, nous a dressé l'enseigne de salut, jusqu'aux bouts de la terre?"[842] In Christ's death, resurrection, and inception of Holy Communion, all aspects of the physical and spiritual altar coincide. "Or tout cecy se trouve parfaitement en nôtre Seigneur Jesus Christ, qui est tout ensemble, et l'Autel, où on offre le sacrifice, et la Victime qui est offerte, et la Viande que est mangée."[843]

Turretin also illustrates that, unlike many parts of the *Institutes* and his disputations, his sermons are primarily pragmatic in nature. There is, no doubt, a small section dealing

---

[841] *Ibid*., p. 149.
[842] Turrettin, *Sermons sur divers passages*, p. 510. Turretin additionally identifies Christ with Gideon's altar and the tabernacle of the Israelites during the conquest of Canaan.
[843] *Ibid*., p. 516.

with Protestant and Catholic polemics; in this instance, the nature of Catholic altars, which Turretin argues are unbiblical due to his differentiation between physical and spiritual altars. However, the second section of the sermon deals almost exclusively with existential implications. How does Christ's work as the Christian's altar affect a believer's life? To answer this question, Turretin turns to the very mundane idea of eating food. He argues,

> For as Food can be of no use for Nourishment, so long as it lies upon the Table and we only look upon it; but it must be taken in by the Mouth and pass into the Stomach, there to be concocted and digested and afterwards distributed throughout the Body; So is the Case, with regard to Jesus Christ and his Grace. So long as we make it but an Object of meer Contemplation, it will avail us nothing; we must go yet further, to obtain the Comfort of it; must receive it in by the Mouth of Faith and apply it to our selves, as the proper Nourishment of our Souls.[844]

Unlike normal food, though, which the person transforms into his very substance, the spiritual food of the altar—that is the bread and wine taken during the Eucharist—transforms the Christian into the image of Christ. This idea is, in many ways, an anti-Catholic understanding of the Eucharist. Christ's body and blood does not become actual food which is then naturally digested through the normal process, as he believes a Catholic would argue. Rather, the spiritual body and blood presented in the Eucharist transform the real body and blood of the believer into the "nature" of Christ.[845]

Turretin continues this anti-Catholic polemic by appealing to the destruction of the Jewish temple in Jerusalem. He strongly argues that as the temple was destroyed only a

---

[844] Turrettin, *Christian Altar*, p. 170.
[845] *Ibid*., p. 170. Turretin supports this idea with Galatians 2:20, "no longer we, but Christ that liveth in us."

few years after the resurrection of Christ, so too should the rights and ceremonies associated with the Old Testament laws be abandoned. He writes:

> But when God had published his Gospel by the Apostles, had destroy'd the Temple and City of Jerusalem, would it not have been the last Degree of Blindness or Infatuation, to go about to re-establish what had been plainly abolished, and to rebuild what had been irreparably pull'd down, and upon which he had pronounced a more terrible Anathema, than upon him, that should attempt to rebuild the Walls of Jericho?[846]

In Turretin's view, this is precisely what the Roman Catholic Church has done: it has sought to rebuild what God so obviously destroyed through the reintroduction of various feasts, sacrifices, and ceremonies. For Turretin, this constitutes a "return to Judaism" and, in effect, a renunciation of the work of Christ. Because of this, Catholics have no right to approach the spiritual altar of Christ.

Lest one think that Turretin's exhortation is limited only to the Roman Catholic Church, he finishes the sermon by advising his congregation on how they are supposed to approach the spiritual altar of Christ. Unlike the Jews of old who presented an animal to sacrifice each time they came to repent, Christians are not meant to 're-sacrifice' Christ each time they come to the altar. Christ's death has already provided the ultimate sacrifice. Rather, Christians should partake of Christ's blessings freely because he has presented this "holy feast" to them. In fact, Turretin argues that it would be a sin to come to the altar with the mind-set that one was meant to offer Christ again "in sacrifice." Instead, Turretin turns the tables again. Using biblical language, he argues that the responsible Christian is supposed to offer himself as a living sacrifice, holy and pleasing

---

[846] *Ibid*., p. 176.

to the Lord. For the evangelical believer, according to Turretin, nothing could be more profane than to present oneself at the altar of Christ without first reflecting on and repenting of one's sins. Again, in opposition to the Roman Catholic view of the Eucharist, he writes:

> I am convinced, that after the most perfect Sacrifice, offered by Christ, for the Expiation of our Sins, there remains no other propitiatory Sacrifice to be offered, as the Church of Rome erroneously thinks there does: but however we are still bound to offer unto God Eucharistical Sacrifices, or those of Prayer and Praise, in Token of his Benefits to us; not Sacrifices of Bulls or of Lambs, but of our Bodies and Souls, so as to glorify him always in one and t'other, which are his.[847]

It is, then, like his argument against transubstantiation, an assertion in opposition to what he views as the Catholic understanding of the Eucharist. In Turretin's mind, the Roman church is in the practice of re-sacrificing Christ in the manner of the Jews each time they partake of the Eucharist. In contrast, he argues that the evangelical church must re-sacrifice themselves daily in response to God's work on the cross. This self-sacrifice gives them the right to approach the spiritual altar in holiness before God.

What can be said to be Turretin's *modus operandi* in terms of sermon structure and delivery? First, is that he is primarily Christological. Throughout the *True Christian Altar and Sacrifice*, Turretin places Christ's work on the cross as the central focus. It is only in the context of Christ's ministry that the Christian can come to understand the prescriptions for altar sacrifice in the Old Testament and the abrogation of the said rules in the New. Second, it is clear that Turretin sees the whole of the Old and New Testaments as authoritative for the Church. While the New Testament certainly holds

---

[847] *Ibid*., p. 187.

primacy over the Old, Turretin views the whole biblical corpus as relevant and illustrative for evangelical faith. Finally, it can be concluded that Turretin does not preach with scholastic methodologies in mind.[848] In his preaching, Turretin's method fits neatly within the "doctrine-use scheme" that I identified earlier.[849] He begins by reading the text verbatim from the scriptures and then follows-up with meticulous exegesis of the passage. After understanding its proper meaning according to seventeenth-century biblical interpretation, Turretin then moves on to application of the text for the lives of his congregants. According to Kneidel, William Perkins outlined two forms of application: mental and practical. The mental involves how a Christian should think; the practical is about how he acts.[850] Turretin emphasises both with precision. First, he identifies that evangelical Christians consider themselves the sacrifice and then exhorts them to present themselves as such. It has both the mental (the self-understanding of a sacrifice) and the practical (the self-examination and repentance). Therefore, Turretin, in his office of minister of the Word, cannot be considered scholastic. Rather, he must be understood as a preacher in line with the greater *ars* of Early Modern preaching and not lumped in with his methods as a teacher and polemicist.

III. Turretin's Influence on the Helvetic Formula Consensus

The *Helvetic Formula Consensus* was written with the declarative purpose (to quote Klauber) "to condemn and exclude that modified form of Calvinism, which, in the

---

[848] Beach makes a similar argument concerning Turretin's preaching on Predestination. "Turretin's sermon shows that the heart of this doctrine can be presented to the pew while leaning behind the thick and heavy polemics that tilt toward philosophical categories and subtleties.": J. M. Beach, "Preaching Predestination—An Examination of Francis Turretin's Sermon *De L'Affermissement de la Vocation et de l'election du Fidele*", *Mid-America Journal of Theology*, 21 (2010), p. 147.
[849] Ch. 5, p. 243.
[850] Kneidel, "*Ars Praedicandi*," p. 14.

Seventeenth Century, emanated from the theological school at Saumur, represented by Amyraut, Placeaus, and Daillé."[851] Like many interpretations of high orthodoxy, the *Consensus* did not receive a particularly sober analysis until the second half of the twentieth century.[852] There have been, however, some recent inquiries into the *Consensus* that have helped develop its historical context.[853] This section, though, will attempt to place the *Consensus* into the framework of Turretin's thought and try to answer the question, "to what degree does the *Consensus* align with Turretin's theology?" Underlying this issue is the matter of Calvin's legacy. As the *Consensus* indicates, the writers believed themselves to be answering a "modified form of Calvinism."[854] What makes the *Consensus* different than other works by Turretin is that it was not written primarily by him, but, rather, in collaboration with John Henry Heidegger (1633-98) of Zurich and Lucas Gernler (1625-75) of Basel. Therefore, this section aims to identify Turretin's contribution to the *Consensus* in light of our previous analysis of the *Institutes*, his disputations, and his sermons. It will be important, though, to preface this section with an explanation of the *Consensus* itself.

The full title of the *Consensus* is *Formula Consensus Ecclesiarum Helveticarum Reformatarum, circa Doctrinam de Gratia Universali, et connexa, aliaque nonnulla*

---

[851] M. Klauber, "The Helvetic Formula Consensus (1675): An Introduction and Translation," *Trinity Journal*, 11 (1990), p. 115.
[852] Beardslee believes the *Consensus* was of very little theological importance and "produced little by way of vital theological writing or new ideas": J. Beardslee, "Theological Development at Geneva Under Francis and Jean-Alphonse Turretin (1648-1737)," Yale University Ph.D. thesis (1956), p. 10.
[853] Studies include: Klauber, "Helvetic Formula Consensus"; R. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (Oxford, 2003); and J. Dennison, "The Twilight of Scholasticism: Francis Turretin at the Dawn of the Enlightenment," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, pp. 244-55. Two Ph.D. theses have also helped understand the *Consensus's* historical context: D. Grohman, "The Genevan Reaction to the Saumur Doctrine of Hypothetical Universalism: 1635-1685," Knox College Ph.D. thesis (1971), and Beardslee, "Theological Development at Geneva."
[854] Klauber, "Helvetic Formula Consensus," p. 115.

capita.[855] It is clear, then, that the *Consensus* had a strict goal in mind; it was not intended to be a full treatment of the Reformed faith. Klauber notes that the *Consensus* developed as a response to the growing adherence to the doctrine of hypothetical universalism.[856] This assertion becomes self-evident when one realises that the doctrine is addressed in the title. However, two other lingering doctrines are also addressed: first is the issue of the vowel points in the Hebrew Bible. Scholars of the Hebrew Bible now understand that the vowel points were inserted into the manuscripts of the Old Testament during the Middle Ages. This had been an issue within the Church since before the Reformation, however. By the seventeenth century, the debate over the divinity of the vowel points had become a matter of Protestant/Catholic polemic. Though the theologians of the Medieval Church never came to a consensus concerning the vowel points, it became apparent that undermining their divinity could be used as a weapon against *sola scriptura*.[857] By the time of the *Consensus*, the Reformed were nowhere near a clear doctrinal position. In fact, by the 1620s some within the Reformed wings were arguing in favour of the non-divinity of the vowel points.[858]

The issue, however, was clearly important for the Reformed as it is the first point argued in the *Consensus*, constituting Canons I-III. The *Consensus* is firmly grounded, as appropriate to Turretin, on God as the sovereign ruler. In Canon I, the consensus reads "Deus T.O.M. verbum suum, quod est potentia ad salutem omni credenti, non tantium per Mosem, Prophetas et Apostolos scripto mandati curavit: sed etiam pro eo scripto paternè

---

[855] BPU, MS Fr. 468, f. 99r.
[856] Klauber, "Helvetic Formula Consensus," p. 103. On hypothetical universalism, see above Ch. 1, p. 17
[857] Muller, *After Calvin*, p. 147.
[858] Muller specifically cites the *Arcanum punctationis revelatum* (1624) of Louis Cappel (1585-1658) which argued, "the variety of the pointing of the text, the rabbinic discussion of variants, and the failure of the vocalization to follow a uniform rule indicate not the antiquity of the points but the gradual invention of a system of vocalization by many editors over the course of centuries": *Ibid*., p. 150.

hactenus vigilavit et excubavit, ne Sathana astu vel fraude humanâ ullâ vitiati posset."[859] The establishment of biblical inspiration in God's sovereignty is precisely what Turretin does in the *Institutes*. In *Locus* II, *Quaestio* X, on the subject *De Puritate Fontium*, the incorruptibility of the authentic biblical manuscripts is evidenced first by *Providentia Dei*, which could not allow corrupt manuscripts to exist.[860] The *Consensus* echoes Turretin's argument from the *Institutes* arguing: 1) the Masoretic Codex has primacy over all other Hebrew editions, 2) the Masoretic Codex should not be compared and contrasted with previous versions in order to find a "superior" edition, and 3) biblical criticism in relation to the manuscripts should not rest on human will and reason. Much had been made of Cappel's argument against the primacy of the Masoretic text alone, but Turretin spends very little time on it. In the *Institutes*, *Locus* II, *Quaestio* XII is devoted to Cappel's work, but it is far from a contentious section. Throughout, Turretin refers to Cappel as *doctissimus viri* (learned man) and takes great strides to give Cappel the benefit of the doubt.[861] The real issue at hand in both the *Institutes* and the *Consensus* is the eroding of God's providence.

The second and shortest section of the *Consensus* is on hypothetical universalism. Due to the space devoted to predestination and the divine decrees in the previous chapter, it will not be necessary to rehash the entirety of the argument formed in the *Consensus*. However, a few points are in order. First, the *Consensus* anticipates Turretin's argument that the decrees of creation, the fall, the sending of Christ, the calling of the elect and the

---

[859] BPU, MS Fr. 468, f. 99v.
[860] F. Turretino, *Institutio Theologicae Elencticae* (3 vols, Geneva, 1679-85), I p. 109.
[861] Before getting into the core of his argument, Turretin writes, "In taking up this subject, we do not wish to detract from the reputation of a man deserving well otherwise of the church of God, but only to confirm the opinion thus far constantly held in the church concerning the unimpaired authority of the sacred text …" This is not a benefit that he extends to his Catholic opponents: *Elenctic Theology*, I p. 117.

damning of the reprobate were all instituted before the creation of the world (Canon IV). This was done solely through God's *beneplacito*; his good pleasure. Again, the *Consensus*, much like Turretin himself, is careful to place the decrees in their correct order. Heidegger writes, "Atque ita quidem hac in re Deus gloriam suam illustrare constituit ut decreverit primo quidem hominem integrum creare; tum ejusdem lapsum permittre, ac demum ex lapsis quorundam misereri, adeoque eosdem eligere; alios vero in corrupta massa relinquere, aeternoque tandem exitio devovere."[862] As with the *Institutes*, the decree to permit the fall comes before the decree to elect and reprobate. The fall also produces a "corrupta massa" from which both those destined for glory and damnation come. Finally, the decree to send Christ as mediator was also subsequent to God's decree to elect and reprobate. Therefore, the *Consensus* firmly denies: 1) God's ineffectual desire (*desiderio inefficaci*) to save on the condition of belief of all humans; 2) Christ's election as mediator to all people; and 3) that election is only effectual in those to whom he gave faith. Turretin, Heidegger and Gernler would certainly agree with this final point in essence, but not in the way the proposition is structured. Only God can grant saving faith, but it is only granted in those for whom Christ came to die. It is a reiteration of Turretin's main argument from the *Institutes*: God cannot have an ineffectual will; what he wills is effectual in the fact that he willed it.

Finally, the *Consensus* deals with the imputation of Adam's sin upon humanity (Canons VII-XII). The implications of the non-imputation of Adam's sin have ramifications reaching back to Calvin's *Institutes*. In the *Institutes*, he continually refers to the "corrupt mass" from which both the elect and reprobate emerge. The basic

[862] BPU, MS Fr. 468, f. 100r.

understanding of the imputation of Adam's sin is this: when Adam sinned and humanity fell, all of his posterity inherited his corruption.[863] In contrast, Josué de la Place (1596-1665)[864], another theologian at the Academy in Saumur, proposed the mediate imputation of Adam's sin; that is, "basing the ground of human condemnation on individual depravity, rather than on a depravity derived from Adam's sin."[865] The Canons of the Synod of Dort (1619) had doubled-down on this doctrine in the very first article of the first canon, reading, "As all men have sinned in Adam, and have become exposed to the curse and eternal death, God would have done no injustice to any one, if he had determined to leave the whole human race under sin and the curse, and to condemn them on account of sin."[866] Throughout Turretin's *Institutes*, he constantly returns to the theology of the corrupt mass. In *Locus* IV, *On the Decrees of God and Predestination in Particular*, Turretin contrasts the predestination of angels and humans, the primary difference being that angels were created unequal—some with the ability to sin, others without—while all humans, from God's perspective, were created with the *intention* of becoming corrupt through the consent of the fall.[867] Again, in the same *Locus*, Turretin argues that Isaac and Ishmael and Jacob and Esau were taken from the same corrupt mass (as St Paul writes in Romans 9:21) to show, on the one hand, God's gratuitous election and, on the other, his free and just rejection.[868] For the Reformed up until Josué de la

---

[863] "We thus see that the impurity of parents is transmitted to their children, so that all, without exception, are originally depraved" and "Therefore, if you look to themselves, you will see the offspring of Adam giving token of the common corruption of the mass. That they proceed not to extreme and desperate impiety is not owing to any innate goodness in them, but because the eye of God watches for their safety and his hand is stretched over them": *Christian Religion*, pp. 146-54, 644-5.
[864] For a short biography of de la Place see: D. L. Jenkins, *Saumur Redux: Josué de la Place and the Question of Adam's Sin* (Harleston, 2008).
[865] Klauber, "Helvetic Formula Consensus," p. 104.
[866] T. Scott, *The Articles of the Synod of Dort* (Philadelphia, PA, 1841), p. 260.
[867] *Elenctic Theology*, I p. 337.
[868] *Ibid*., p. 345.

Place (1596-1665), it would be unconscionable to assume that Adam's sin did not condemn all of humanity.

The *Consensus* proceeds with the same argument that Turretin will eventually propose in the *Institutes*. First, God created humanity good in Adam and Eve with the assurance of eternal life through their obedience. The *Consensus* refers to this as God's "Covenant of Works."[869] By obeying his will, God promised humanity that they would retain eternal life and bliss in communion with him (Canon VII). Canon X makes a very important clarification concerning this covenant, though. The *Consensus* reads: "God entered into the Covenant of Works not only with Adam for himself, but also, in him as the head and root with the whole human race."[870] This covenant, then, was binding not only upon Adam, but upon all the human race through Adam as the first and cause of all humans. Therefore, when Adam broke the covenant through his disobedience in the garden, he, likewise, broke the covenant for humanity as a whole. This distinction is incredibly important because, as prescribed in the *Consensus*, Adam's sin indicts the whole human race; in other words, Adam's sin is immediately imputed to his descendants. As the *Consensus* describes it, "So Adam by his sorrowful fall sinned and lost the benefits promised in the Covenant not only for himself, but also for the whole human race that would be born by the flesh."[871]

This makes original sin two-fold in the view of the orthodox. First, original sin is imputed through Adam's first sin. Secondly, it is ingrained upon humanity's conception; that is, humanity by its nature is unable to do anything except sin unless God grants

---

[869] Klauber, "Helvetic Formula Consensus," p. 117.
[870] *Ibid*.
[871] *Ibid*.

individuals the ability to do good. Again, though, the main qualm of the *Consensus* against the mediate imputation of sin is that it harms God's "coelesit veritate"; God's "heavenly truth."[872] It is, in their mind, an assault upon God's will to declare Adam's sin anything less than immediately imputed to humanity. In the same way, Canons XIII to XXVI finish by detailing the nature of salvation based upon this Covenant of Works and two-fold nature of sin. The most crucial point is that now that humanity is under sin and has broken its Covenant of Works, God, from before the creation of the world, designed the Covenant of Grace for sinners under the election of Christ as the new Adam. However, this election is not for all, but only for those to whom God has granted the faculty of faith by his good will. There is, now, a two-fold covenant of salvation: works and grace. In humanity's place, God has elected Christ to fulfil both covenants for those who believe. The *Consensus*, then, reiterates the points made by the Canons of Dort: 1) All have sinned through Adam and are, therefore, guilty of original and inherent sin; 2) In Christ, God, from before the creation of the world, elected some to salvation and some to damnation; 3) This was not done through his foreknowledge of good works, but only according to his good will and perfect justice; 4) Therefore, Christ's death was limited only to the elect because what God wills must come to pass; and 5) Salvation is only attainable in those who believe and belief can only be granted by God. Therefore, the *Consensus* makes a strong, though cogent, reiteration of the Canons of Dort, re-emphasizing what the Reformed had considered orthodox for over fifty years.

What the *Consensus* also does is it places God's will at the forefront in a way that illustrates his mercy. According to the *Consensus*, because of Adam's sin all are now

[872] BPU, MS 468, f. 101r.

guilty. However, through his mercy God provided a way for some to come to salvation. For the orthodox, this is far more merciful than what humanity deserved, being the guilty party in the Covenant of Works. What Heidegger, Turretin and Gernler were attempting to do, therefore, is combat the Catholic, and now Amyrauldian, idea that predestination is an unfair and unjust system. In their view of scripture, it would have been far more just for God to condemn all to hell due to Adam's sin. Because God is merciful, however, he provided a way for some to come to salvation through Christ. For the Reformed, this not only maintains God's attributes, but also illustrates his graciousness towards humanity. To move away from this doctrine would be to limit or endanger God's attributes of justice, mercy, and full actualisation of his works in his being. The *Consensus*, like all of Turretin's writings, therefore, presents a thoroughly theocentric understanding of human life, salvation, and damnation. God's good pleasure reigns supreme and the *Consensus* provides a theologically sound reiteration of the idea of God's supremacy in all matters of human existence.

IV. Conclusion

We can come to several conclusions concerning Turretin's other works. First, Turretin was willing and able to appropriate methodologies suitable to the nature of the task. In his disputations, he is polemical, biblical and philosophical, much like in the *Institutes*. However, in his sermons, Turretin becomes an exegete, detailing minute aspects of the Bible in order to address the existential and theological needs of his congregation. In the *Consensus*, we see a pithy version of Turretin through Heidegger. The *Consensus* attempts to simplify what Reformed theologians had taught since the

Reformation and it paved the way for what would be expanded in the *Institutes* (1679-85). Second, Turretin's theology is theocentric; that is, he desires to maintain God's integrity in all things. We see this in his disputations, where he denies the Pope's authority as head of the Church, as that is already Christ's office. We see this in his sermons, where he instructs his congregants to allow God to reign supreme and transform their lives when they approach the altar. Finally, we see it in the *Consensus*, when the three writers refute the universalists' ideas that human will complements the divine. God does everything according to his good pleasure and the universalists do nothing but distort this idea. Ultimately, it is clear that Turretin took great care to promote his understanding of orthodoxy regardless of the situation. After analysing both the *Institutes* and his wider corpus, we see that Turretin believed he stood in clear continuity with the late-Medieval period and the Reformation. In contrast, the universalists, Arminians, and Papists had erred, in Turretin's view, by introducing innovative doctrine unknown to the universal Church.

Chapter 6: Turretin's Influence on the Later Reformed Tradition

The penultimate chapter of this thesis will be devoted to the influence Turretin maintained on the Reformed Tradition after his death in 1687.[873] This is incredibly important as one analyses the development of the Tradition as a whole. This thesis has been careful to argue that the Reformed Tradition possessed myriad influences which contributed to its overall evolution and this final chapter seeks to understand how Turretin played his part. One important caveat to add as a reminder is that this chapter does not seek to place Turretin on a pedestal above and beyond any of the other important Reformed theologians, as many historians have done in the past with Calvin and Beza. Rather, this chapter intends to build upon the arguments of previous chapters in order to establish Turretin's overall importance for the Tradition. Therefore, the reader would be making a mistake if he went beyond what this chapter intends by making Turretin the sole and exhaustive influence upon later Reformed theologians in general and those whom I shall be analysing in particular. With the preliminaries understood, this chapter will now move on to three important areas of Reformed life in the post-Turretin world. First, this chapter will analyse the Reformed Tradition in eighteenth-century Geneva so as to understand Turretin's immediate impact. Second, we will seek to evaluate Turretin's impact upon post-seventeenth century Scotland, where it is claimed he had

[873] Quentin Skinner has argued, persuasively, that a mere connection between two persons, whether explicit or not, is insufficient to establish a clear lineage of historical thought. This chapter, therefore, will seek to show either a continuity or discontinuity of thought between Turretin and later Reformed theologians: Q. Skinner, "The Limits of Historical Explanations," *Philosophy*, 41 (1966), pp. 199-215.

some important influence.[874] Finally, we will cross the Atlantic Ocean and examine the Civil War era United States, especially the work of the Princeton theologians, in order fully to understand Turretin's impact upon American Reformed theology. Again, this chapter seeks not to uncover exhaustively all aspects of Turretin's posthumous life; rather, we will strive to illustrate Turretin's theology and how it translated into future generations and contexts.

I. Geneva

Much like the scholarship concerning seventeenth-century Geneva and the orthodox Reformed, historical studies into eighteenth-century Geneva are scarce. Jennifer Powell McNutt's monograph does an excellent job of summarising the historiography on the subject, noting that studies have primarily dealt with the time that the famous philosopher Voltaire (1694-1778) stayed in the city.[875] Another aspect that has shifted the historiography of eighteenth-century Geneva is the 'secularisation theory.' This theory "states that the rise of modernity leads inevitably to the decline of religion, which has had discernible effects upon the place of religion in society today."[876] This idea produced an interpretation of Enlightenment Europe in which a unified voice for secularisation swept across the continent. In other words, there may have been many voices within the Enlightenment, but there was only one Enlightenment.[877] Recent studies have begun to

---

[874] P. Ryken, "Scottish Reformed Scholasticism," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, pp. 196-210.
[875] J. P. McNutt, *Calvin Meets Voltaire: The Clergy of Geneva in the Age of Enlightenment* (Burlington, VT, 2013), pp. 1-2. Indeed, McNutt's survey also illustrates how contemporaries of Voltaire viewed the city as anything but Reformed, citing Voltaire's declaration, "I know of no other city where there are fewer Calvinists than in this city of Calvin," and Jean Le Rond d'Alembert's encyclopaedia entry on Geneva, referring to its clergy as 'Socinian.'
[876] *Ibid*., p. 8
[877] *Ibid*., pp. 8-9.

erode this thesis, proposing instead that Christianity was one of many Enlightenment factors and that secularisation theory relies too heavily on the perspectives of the *philosophes* at the expense of other voices.[878]

When one begins to analyse Geneva in particular, it becomes apparent that though the *Helvetic Formula Consensus* had been in effect for several years, the arguments plaguing the Company of Pastors and Academy were still raging in earnest. When Turretin died in 1687, his only surviving child, Jean-Alphonse (J. A.), was but a teenager. In a few years, though, J. A. Turretin would succeed his father as the minister of the Italian congregation in Geneva and would become the founding chair of Church History at the Academy.[879] In 1701 J. A. Turretin was named the rector of the Academy and he was eventually named chair of Theology in 1705.[880] Klauber argues that J. A. Turretin was primarily combating the progression and spread of Deism and Atheism which led him to develop a theology based primarily on rationalism.[881] Consequently, J. A. Turretin, while maintaining various orthodox doctrines such as the Trinity and Incarnation of Christ, rejected the doctrine of the internal witness of Scripture.[882] Additionally, J. A. Turretin abandoned the use of scholastic methods in theology. Klauber rightly observes that this does not mean that J. A. Turretin was harking back to Calvin's method or theology.

---

[878] McNutt notes (*Ibid*., pp. 11-12 [n. 44-49].) several recent studies that have challenged the 'secularisation thesis,' including: N. Aston, *Christianity and Revolutionary Europe, 1750-1830* (Cambridge, 2002); S.J. Barnett, *The Enlightenment and Religion: The Myths of Modernity* (Manchester, 2003); and H. McLeod and W. Ustorf (eds), *The Decline of Christendom in Western Europe, 1750-2000* (Cambridge, 2003).
[879] M. Klauber, "Theological Transition in Geneva: From Jean-Alphonse Turretin to Jacob Vernet," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, p. 258.
[880] M. Klauber, "Jean-Alphonse Turrettini and the Abrogation of the Formula Consensus in Geneva," *Westminster Theological Journal*, 53 (1991), p. 325.
[881] Klauber notes that older disputes between the Reformed and other Christian traditions (i.e. Catholicism, Arminianism, ect.) gave way to the "far more dangerous" ideas of deism and atheism: M. Klauber, "The Uniqueness of Christ in Post-Reformation Reformed Theology: From Francis Turretin to Jean-Alphonse Turretin" in J. Ballor, *et al*. (eds), *Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism: Studies in Honor of Richard A. Muller on the Maturation of a Theological Tradition* (Leiden, 2013), pp. 699-710.
[882] Klauber, "Theological Transition in Geneva," p. 259.

Rather, J. A. Turretin relied upon the "external marks" of rationalism, causing some later historians to refer to him as a 'Socinian.'[883] This would have clearly put J.A. and Francis Turretin at odds. But if J. A. is not Francis's theological heir, then who was?

That honour would be bestowed upon his nephew, Benedict Pictet. It was Pictet, after all, who presided over Francis's funeral and declared that Turretin was "the blessed one." McNutt writes:

> Succession to the next Turrettini generation then brought with it the influence of "deists" teaching at Geneva's Academy. With this shift, the Reformation legacy was put aside, and in the words of Philips, "the vision established by Calvin and Beza was lost." Meanwhile, Bénédict Pictet (1655-1724) is heralded as the exception to this narrative of religious decline as the seemingly lone figure seeking to mediate between the Reformed Scholasticism of one Turrettini and the Enlightened Orthodoxy of the other."[884]

Pictet, like both Turretins, was highly involved in the running of the Company of Pastors and Academy at Geneva. Pictet was a prodigy from the beginning, becoming *préteur* as a student in 1674, professor of Theology in 1686, and serving as rector of the Academy twice, first in 1690-94, then in 1711-17.[885] Pictet studied under Turretin from the time that he was twenty and, though he travelled throughout Europe studying, he returned to Geneva as the "last champion of the century of orthodoxy."[886] He would also follow

---

[883] *Ibid*., pp. 260-1. Both Klauber and McNutt cite James Good (1850-1924) as a main source of disdain concerning eighteenth-century theology in Geneva. Good writes, "How great was the descent from Calvin to this. Geneva, the city that, under Calvin, had been a city set on a hill, whose light could not be hid – the model city, the wonder of its day – had fallen into an abyss. The church which so successfully had resisted all the plots of Romanism for centuries was finally captured by its opposite, rationalism. For two centuries and more, Geneva had held to its Calvinism; but half a century had undone it all": Good in McNutt, *Calvin Meets Voltaire*, p. 6.

[884] McNutt, *Calvin Meets Voltaire*, pp. 3-6.

[885] *Université Genève*, I pp. 636-7, 641, 645.

[886] *Ibid*., I pp. 529-30. "Cette influence, que plusieurs années de voyages et de résidence à l'étranger, que des relations suivies avec les Claude, les Daillé, les Basnage, laissèrent dominante, explique la situation qu'il occupe dans l'Académie. Nommé suppléant de son maître en 1686, lorsqu'il monta, en 1687, dans la

Turretin as pastor of the Italian congregation and professor of theology before J.A. Turretin would assume both positions. It was also Pictet who would defend the ill-fated *Helvetic Formula Consensus* against the younger Turretin and others of the Geneva Academy. With his "head, blood and heart" firmly in line with the old Geneva of the seventeenth century, Pictet "defended the works of the orthodox step by step, just as his ancestors defended the city walls."[887]

Jean-Alphonse, on his part, had no problem condemning the work of his father and the other seventeenth-century orthodox, writing "The century of the Reformation caused division and schism; the century that we have just finished consecrated these divisions by the formulas of discord; now that we have woken up to a new century, we ought to start it by covering the errors of our fathers with a coat of love, and in seeking to unite all churches in the same spirit by the bonds of peace."[888] Much of this denunciation came from the fact that Turretin's mentor was none other than Louis Tronchin, Francis Turretin's opponent who would outlive him by nearly twenty years.[889] Tronchin made his dislike for the *Consensus* known during the original debate surrounding its acceptance and it is clear that he passed his disapproval of the *Consensus* on to Turretin. By 1705, the year of Tronchin's death, J.A. Turretin had significant influence over the Company of Pastors and Academy, having been made professor of Church History in 1697, promoted to professor of Theology in 1705 (after Tronchin's death), and was concurrently serving

---

chaire que le décès de ce dernier rendait vacante, il y fut, à la fois, le premier représentant d'une génération nouvelle et le dernier champion d'une orthodoxie centenaire."

[887] *Ibid*., I p. 538. "Il défendit l'oeuvre de l'orthodoxie pied a pied, comme ses ancêtres avaient défendu les murs de la cité."

[888] Klauber, "Abrogation of the Formula Consensus," p. 331.

[889] *Ibid*., p. 332.

his only term as rector (1701-11).[890] This meant that when Turretin decided the *Consensus* had to go it would have been very difficult to stop him.

Ultimately, Klauber argues that there are three reasons the *Consensus* was abrogated: first was the general trend towards a more broad and less theological educational course at the Academy.[891] In the early eighteenth century, the Academy added a professor of mathematics (1704), a professor in oriental languages (1719), and by 1755 a professor of medicine.[892] Second, the theology of Saumur was no longer a threat, as the Academy had been closed after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. The *Consensus* was simply addressing an academy that no longer existed. Finally, the old-guard, in general, began to die off. With Pictet and his colleague Jean-Louis Calendrini (1703-58) as the only remaining defenders of the *Consensus*, Turretin and others were able to sway the Company and the Councils of Geneva to annul it.[893] In 1725, after many years of debate and the death of Pictet, Turretin finally prevailed.

In a sermon given to the Small Council of Geneva, J.A. Turretin argued strongly against the *Consensus* arguing that it was "extremely offensive to other Christians, which are not of the same sentiments; particularly those of Germany and England, who are continually complaining of it."[894] Turretin believed that the "pure Word of Faith"

---

[890] *Université Genève*, I pp. 636, 641.
[891] This is best exemplified by J.A. Turretin's repudiation of scholastic methods. He writes, "The last area of progress would be the abandoning or at least the reduction of the strict requirements of the scholastic heritage. One should occupy oneself more voluntarily to natural history. One should conduct more experiments. One should learn more about the vault of heaven, the kingdom of the animals, the properties of minerals and plants. The entire laboratory of nature would be opened to our investigations. In this area, the works of Aristotle, Theophrastus and Pliny would be relevant. And because all these things are beginning to be better and more exactly known today, I think, without better advice, that they should be taught more fully in our schools": Klauber, "Abrogation of the Formula Consensus," pp. 332-3.
[892] *Université Genève*, I p. 641.
[893] Klauber, "Abrogation of the Formula Consensus," pp. 334-5.
[894] J.A. Turretin, "The Speech of Mr. Turrettine, Rector of the Academy at Geneva, made to the Lesser Council for Abolishing the Subscription to the Formula Consensus," in S. Chandler, *The Case of*

provided enough evidence to abrogate the *Consensus* since it is far more restrictive than what is presented in both the Bible and the Confessions of the Reformed Tradition. "Besides," he writes, "our society hath reflected, that the worthy Churches of Switzerland, and even those where the *Consensus* hath been established, particularly those of Zurich and Basel, do not now require any subscription."[895] Of particular concern to Turretin was the Reformed Tradition's relationship with other Christian denominations, primarily the Lutherans. He attempted to portray the *Consensus* as a dividing line between the Lutheran and Reformed traditions and their continued cooperation. "Every one knows that these Matters are the great Stumbling-block to the Lutherans. They have said it openly in their Writings, and declared, that whilst we use this Rigour in the Affair, it signifies nothing to talk to them of Peace."[896] In general, Turretin acknowledged, candidly, that the Reformed have simply become less strict in their adherence to the doctrines put forth in the *Consensus*. He indicated that no other traditional centre of Reformed thought adhered to any subscription for ministry any longer. Subscription was a relic of the past; not even Rome was as adamant concerning difficult subjects even though "they are divided about them as well as our Churches, and yet their Church tolerates them all."[897] It is evident, then, that Turretin valued ecumenism above all. There will always be difficult discussion in which theologians differ greatly; in order to progress, however, Geneva needed to seek agreement instead of perpetuating division.

Subscription to Explanatory Articles of Faith, as a Qualification for Admission into the Christian Ministry (London, 1757), p. 161.
[895] *Ibid*.
[896] *Ibid*., p. 165.
[897] *Ibid*., p. 168. This is an astounding statement considering the anti-Catholic polemics of Calvin, Beza and Francis Turretin.

Francis Turretin's prevalence in eighteenth-century Geneva, then, was limited. Though he died in the waning years of the seventeenth century, it is clear that his way of thinking was dying long before. His nephew Bénédict Pictet attempted to inherit the mantle of the Reformed orthodox, but to little success. Rather, what transpired in eighteenth-century Geneva was a concerted and centralised attempt to abandon Reformed orthodoxy by the son of orthodoxy's most ardent defender. In this way, one cannot help but conclude that Francis Turretin's overall impact upon Geneva was restricted. However, one cannot make the same claim in other areas of the Reformed world after Turretin, which is where we now turn.

II. Scotland

The post-Reformation period in Scotland remains, in many ways, a mystery. Overshadowed by first generation reformers like John Knox, the history of post-Reformation orthodoxy in Scotland is often troublesome. Part of the problem lies in the fact that Scotland was a relatively small actor on the world stage, at least directly.[898] The other problem is common to almost all areas of post-Reformation history: a problem of historiographical bias. Ryken writes, "By its very nature, Scottish Reformed Scholasticism demands to be placed within the broad narrative of Protestant Orthodoxy. Yet on those rare occasions when Scottish ecclesiastical studies have given it any attention at all, scholasticism has been greeted with suspicion, even hostility. Its

[898] Ryken, "Scottish Reformed Scholasticism," p. 196. Henderson writes quite bluntly, "Neither in art, nor in literature, nor in scholarship, nor in philosophy, nor in science, nor in politics, nor in religion, did seventeenth-century Scotland produce anyone truly great": G. D. Henderson, *Religious Life in Seventeenth-Century Scotland* (Cambridge, 1937), p. 60. The next section of this chapter will illustrate how Scottish Common Sense realism had an impact on nineteenth-century America, making Scotland's impact more indirect.

influence has often been considered pernicious."[899] Ryken's goal in his essay was to expand historians' thinking concerning Scottish scholasticism through a series of hypotheses, not theses.[900] Of particular importance, though, is his contention that there was already a steady stream of Reformed Scholastics coming from Scotland. He mentions John Sharp (1572-1647), John Cameron (1579-1625), and Samuel Rutherford (1600-61) amongst others.[901] The difficulty comes, though, in the fact that many of these Scottish writers did not write or print in Scotland. Sharp, for instance, wrote his *Cursus theologicus* while exiled in France.[902] Far from being a pernicious import, as historiographers have argued, Ryken shows that scholasticism was as natural to Scots as to the Swiss. One thing that is certain, however, is the Scottish adherence to the Synod of Dort. There were several English and Scottish theologians present at the Synod of Dort

---

[899] Ryken, "Scottish Reformed Scholasticism," pp. 196-7. Henderson even considers scholasticism as one of the primary problems concerning seventeenth-century education, namely the boredom that many students experienced at the feet of their lecturers who simply passed on exactly what was taught to them: Henderson, *Religious Life*, pp. 122-3. Additionally, Drummond refers to seventeenth-century Reformed theology as "frozen as fast as Alpine ice." This in contrast to the "sinuous, subtle paths traced by Cameron and made plain by Amyrault at Saumur": A. Drummond, *The Kirk and the Continent* (Edinburgh, 1956), p. 143. Finally, Mechie repeats the claim that scholasticism of the seventeenth century "held the Calvinism of the Westminster standards in a rigid mechanical fashion, making the doctrine of predestination too central in the system": S. Mechie, "The Theological Climate in Early Eighteenth Century Scotland," in D. Shaw (ed.), *Reformation and Revolution: Essays Presented to the Very Reverend Principal Emeritus Hugh Watt, D.D., D.Litt. on the Sixtieth Anniversary of his Ordination* (Edinburgh, 1967), p. 267.

[900] It is, in many ways, a thought experiment. He quickly admits that much of what he is claiming may turn out to be false: Ryken, "Scottish Reformed Scholasticism," pp. 197-8.

[901] Of particular importance in Ryken's work is the theology of Thomas Boston (1676-1732), who Ryken claims stands in direct lineage with Turretin. Though Boston does not explicitly mention Turretin or many other Reformed theologians, his method and theology is consistent with post-Reformation theologians. See P. Ryken, *Thomas Boston as Preacher of the Fourfold State* (Carlisle, 1999), and J. Mackenzie, "The Reformed Doctrine of the Will of God in the Theology and Pastoral Practice of Thomas Boston," University of Aberdeen Ph.D. thesis (2011), p. 14.

[902] Mackenzie, "Reformed Doctrine of the Will," p. 201. This, of course, does not mean that his writings did not make it to Scotland; rather, it illustrates the difficulty in pinpointing a thoroughly "Scottish" scholasticism before the seventeenth century.

who "helped to set the direction for the Netherlands' British churches."[903] Therefore, Scotland, if anything, was decidedly Reformed.

In terms of Turretin's direct influence upon eighteenth-century Scotland, one must look not to Turretin, but to Leonardus Rijssenius (1636-1700). In the eighteenth century, Rijssenius began publishing his *Summa Theologiae Elencticae* which was used widely in Scotland, especially in the University of Edinburgh.[904] Used primarily in private tutorials, Rijssenius's work contributed to the "pure scholasticism" taught at the ancient university.[905] The only problem is that Rijssenius's work was really a truncated version of Turretin's *Institutes*.[906] Rijssenius's work is dedicated to the "consuls, aldermen, and senators" of the "illustrious city of Deventer," the Netherlands, making no mention of Turretin at all, and totals only 364 pages, some 1800 fewer than Turretin's *Institutes*.[907] Rijssenius's table of contents is nearly identical to Turretin's, as well, beginning with prolegomena on *theologia* and the Holy Scriptures and finishing with the Last Things (*extremis*). Though not a perfect reproduction of Turretin's work, Rijssenius's *Summa* is an adequate summation of Turretin's very long text.[908] For instance, in Rijssenius's section on predestination he gives a simple explanation, writing: "Praedestinatio est decretum triunius Dei de supremo creaturarum rationalium fine, seu statu, et mediis ad

---

[903] For more on the relationship between the Synod and the British churches, see K. Sprunger, *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden, 1982), pp. 355-7.
[904] L. Rijssenius, *Summa Theologiae Elencticae* (Edinburgh, 1692).
[905] Ryken, "Scottish Reformed Scholasticism," p. 199.
[906] Muller writes that Rijssenius's "system is based directly on Turretin's Institutio": R. Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2003), p. 155.
[907] Rijssenius, *Summa*, Sig. A2r. The Latin first edition of the *Institutes* numbers 2,249 excluding the dedicatory address, preface, table of contents and indexes: F. Turrettino, *Institutio Theologiae Elencticae* (3 vols, Geneva, 1679-85).
[908] For instance, Rijssenius omits chapters on Angels, man before the fall, general and particular sin, free will before the fall and sanctification, and he combines chapters on the law and fall, and adds a chapter on the Ten Commandments.

illum finem necessariis."[909] Though he goes on to elaborate, Rijssenius's explication is nowhere near as detailed as Turretin's. The reason for this is its purpose. Unlike Turretin's *Institutes*, which were written as a clear, logical explanation of the whole corpus of Reformed theology, Rijssenius's summation was, instead, written "ad usum Juventutis Academicae in Scotia."[910]

Rijssenius's *Summa* has several other similar conclusions to Turretin's *Institutes*, though Rijssenius never acknowledges his reliance upon Turretin. For instance, Rijssenius's *caput primum, de Theologia* divides theology into archetypal and ectypal theology, identifying *nostra theologia* as theology that God has revealed to us. Rijssenius is clearly appealing to the Scotian, Thomistic and Turretinian idea that humanity only comprehends the theology that God chooses to reveal; humans cannot know about *theologia in se*, which is only known to God as he is in himself.[911] Additionally, Rijssenius subdivides each *caput* into several *controversia*, reminiscent of both Turretin's *quaestio* and Aquinas's *articulus* structures. In these sections, Rijssenius presents common questions immediately followed by an answer. As an example, his third *controversia* on theology is, "Num philosophia repugnet Theologia, i.e. an eadem sententia servatis oppositionis regulis, possit esse vera in philosophia, falsa in theologia? Neg. contra Luth." After providing four reasons why the Orthodox would deny this proposition, Rijssenius then presents several objections, again, followed by answers. While very similar to Turretin's responses,[912] Rijssenius does not delve as deep into the

---

[909] Rijssenius, *Summa*, p. 78; "Predestination is the decree of the triune God concerning the end of highest rational creatures, his position, and the means to its necessary end."
[910] *Ibid*., title-page.
[911] *Ibid*., p. 1.
[912] In fact, Rijssenius provides two of the same examples of what philosophy cannot teach, i.e. the Trinity and the incarnation. He adds to the list, though, *Mediator Christus*, *vera beatitudo*, and *media quibus ea obtineri potest*: *Ibid*., p. 5 and Turretin, *Institutes*, I p. 46.

controversies. He has instead whittled down Turretin's writings to their most basic dogmatic statements without getting over-encumbered in philosophical or theological distinctions.[913] It is clear, then, that Rijssenius edits Turretin when necessary, placing himself, and Turretin, within the tradition of the Reformed orthodox and the late-medieval scholastic tradition.

Rijssenius's work was first printed in Edinburgh in 1692 by the printer George Mosman.[914] Mosman was a relatively new printer in the late seventeenth century, but he was given a contract by the General Assembly[915] after the Glorious Revolution due to his strong adherence to Presbyterianism before the Revolution.[916] In 1690, the General Assembly made Mosman the "printer to the kirk," a position he, and subsequently his wife, would hold until 1712.[917] Though an important contract, it was not, however, a lucrative one.[918] Mann notes that after the death of George and his wife, Mosman's children had to sell their stock and did not have enough funds to continue their contract with the General Assembly. This lack of capital meant that Rijssenius's work, though a part of the course of study at the University of Edinburgh, did not provide enough to sustain the printer very long into the eighteenth century.[919]

---

[913] This makes sense in the context of Rijssenius's goal for the book to be "useful for the youth at the academies of Scotland": *Ibid*., pp. 4-5.
[914] H. Aldis, *A List of Books Printed in Scotland before 1700, including those Printed Furth of the Realm for Scottish Booksellers with Brief Notes on the Printers and Stationers* (Edinburgh, 1904), p. 86.
[915] The General Assembly is the name of the national synod of the Scottish Presbyterian churches. It is first called the General Assembly in 1563: M. Lynch, "Calvinism in Scotland, 1559-1638," in *International Calvinism*, p. 231.
[916] A. Mann, *The Scottish Book Trade 1500-1720* (East Linton, 2000), pp. 41-2.
[917] *Ibid*., p. 41.
[918] *Ibid*.
[919] In general, Scottish printers were less successful than their English counterparts. Mann concludes that the only "super rich" printer by London standards was Agnes Campbell, who assumed the role of printer to the kirk in the early eighteenth century: *Ibid*., p. 194.

In the nineteenth century, Turretin's works were republished as *Francisci Turrettini Opera* by the press of John D. Lowe in Edinburgh and H. Bohn in London.[920] Lowe also published a series of magazines entitled, *Lowe's Edinburgh Magazine and Protestant and Educational Journal*. The *Journal* indicates that in late 1846 and early 1847 Lowe published thirty-seven new books and tracts.[921] Additionally, Lowe had at least two shops in Edinburgh, one at the printer on George Street and the second at Princes Street.[922] Lowe was, therefore, an average printer in Edinburgh dedicated to the publication of religious works for both education and personal piety. Included in Lowe's version of the *Opera* were the *Institutes* in three volumes with the fourth volume consisting of Turretin's disputation against the Roman Church, as well as his ten minor disputations.

By the mid-nineteenth century, Scottish universities were under the same pressure to expand their curricula beyond traditional scholasticism.[923] This led to the University of Edinburgh's faculty to incorporate Enlightenment ideas and Cartesian philosophy, in much the same way that the Academy in Geneva did.[924] Part of this growth in the nineteenth century happened, though, due to the continued emergence of a strong, Scottish printing industry.[925] Garside attributes this to four developments within

---

[920] F. Turrettini, *Opera* (4 vols, Edinburgh, 1847-8); S. Low (ed.), *The Catalogue of Books Published from January, 1835, to January 1863* (Millwood, NY, 1976), p. 787.
[921] *Lowe's Edinburgh Magazine and Protestant and Educational Journal* (Edinburgh, 1846-7).
[922] The printed copy of the *Opera* at the British Library contains a note of sale from 30 November 1852 in which John Lindsay purchased the *Opera* in the presence of Henry Hutchinson between the hours of three and five in the afternoon: Turrettino, *Opera*, title-page.
[923] R. Emerson, "Scottish Universities in the Eighteenth Century, 1690-1800," in J. Leith (ed.), *Facets of Education in the Eighteenth Century*, Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century, 167 (Oxford, 1977), pp. 453-74.
[924] *Ibid*., p. 466.
[925] P. Garside, "Literature in the Marketplace: The Rise of the Scottish Literary Market," in B. Bell (ed.), *The Edinburgh History of the Book in Scotland* (4 vols, Edinburgh, 2007), III pp. 203-77.

nineteenth-century Scotland: 1) the growth of both printers and a strong "infrastructure" for printing; 2) the "indigenous" desire for new books from the growing families in the middle and upper classes; 3) trade and communications improvements provided publishers with better knowledge and access to London printers; and 4) the emerging interest in Scottish history and self-identity.[926] These developments, in many ways, made Scotland a premier printing city rivalling London.

Religious and confessional texts were not immune to this development. In the early 1840s, Scottish printing house William Collins & Co. produced upwards of thirty thousand copies of the Old and New Testaments and offered the whole Bible in various formats.[927] Additionally, classics of religious literature began to be republished, including some of the works of John Knox and John Bunyan's enduring *Pilgrim's Progress*. Turretin's *Opera* emerged in the middle of this publishing frenzy. Its readership, however, would have been decidedly academic as it was not translated into English, but remained in its original Latin. Primary school students were only required to read various biblical and ecclesiastical documents in English; this meant that Turretin's work would have been required only for the most advanced students within the universities.[928] Additionally, it is clear that Turrtin's work could only be afforded by the elite, as the 1847 English edition of the *Institutes* was priced at 42 shillings,[929] well above the average worker's salary.

---

[926] *Ibid*., pp. 206-7.
[927] P. R. Murray, "Religion," in B. Bell (ed.), *The Edinburgh History of the Book in Scotland* (4 vols, Edinburgh, 2007), III pp. 287-95.
[928] *Idem*, "Education," in B. Bell (ed.), *The Edinburgh History of the Book in Scotland* (4 vols, Edinburgh, 2007), III pp. 324-32. Murray notes that subjects such as Latin, Mathematics and book-keeping were much more unusual than the basics of reading, writing and arithmetic.
[929] Low, *English Catalogue*, p. 787.

In sum, it is difficult, then, to gain a concrete understanding of Turretin's impact upon Scotland. For the most part, it appears to be tangential, at best. It is clear that Rijssenius's work is primarily based upon, if not wholly plagiarised from, Turretin's *Institutes*, though there is no explicit evidence that readers knew of Turretin's inspiration. In addition, Lowe's nineteenth-century *Opera* edition would have had some impact upon Victorian Scots, but there is little evidence to show exactly what this impact was. Ryken's observation that Thomas Boston utilised Turretin, amongst others, is an astute one, as Boston was a rural pastor.[930] If Turretin's influence extended, even tangentially, to the rural areas of Scotland, then it is natural to think that Turretin was also influential amongst the urban centres. Regardless, it is clear that Turretin's impact was significant enough to warrant another Latin edition in 1847-8 that covered not only the *Institutes*, but also his main disputations. The Scottish scholastic theology of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as evidenced by the use of Rijssenius, however, stood in line with the scholastics of the past, making Turretin a *bona fide* Reformed theologian and not a "distorter" as the Calvin vs. the Calvinists proponents claim. One can say with confidence, then, that Turretin's work was not confined to the Swiss context, but emigrated into the British Isles with some limited success.

III. United States of America

While the Reformed Tradition had a profound influence upon the making of early and Civil War era America, perhaps the most important voices after the time of Turretin[931] were the Princeton theologians. Named, aptly, for their work at Princeton Theological

[930] Ryken, "Scottish Reformed Scholasticism," p. 200.
[931] *Ibid*., pp. 292-3.

Seminary in Princeton, New Jersey, in the latter half of the nineteenth century, these theologians professed a mindful Calvinism. That is, much like their seventeenth-century counterparts, the Princeton theologians knowingly and enthusiastically promoted the Reformed faith as *the* Christian faith.[932] "The Princetonians, however, drew upon different aspects of the Reformed heritage as if it constituted a unified whole. In his *Systematic Theology*, for example, [Charles] Hodge regularly interweaves testimony from Calvin, the Second Helvetic Confession of 1566, the English Westminster Confession and Catechism of the mid-seventeenth century, and the works of late seventeenth-century polemicist Francis Turretin to support his own Reformed conclusions."[933] The four most prominent of the Princetonians were Archibald Alexander (1772-1851), Charles Hodge (1797-1878), Archibald Alexander Hodge (1823-86), and Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield (1851-1921).[934] These four men constitute the "principal chairs" of theology during the tumultuous nineteenth century and while they were not the only prominent theologians from Princeton during this time, their well-known works make them the most obvious Princeton representatives.[935] Due to the sheer volume of works, both primary and secondary, on the Princeton theologians, it will be necessary to limit this section to only two: Archibald Alexander and Charles Hodge. They represent the founder and successor of Princeton Seminary and will suffice to show Turretin's influence in the antebellum United States.

---

[932] M. Noll, *The Princeton Theology, 1812-1921: Scripture, Science, and Theological Method from Archibald Alexander to Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2001), pp. 28-9.
[933] *Ibid*., p. 28.
[934] *Ibid*., pp. 13-18.
[935] Alexander 1812-50, C. Hodge 1851-78, A. A. Hodge 1878-86, and Warfield 1887-1902: *Ibid*., p. 13.

Nineteenth-century America was no less a time of turmoil than it was for the European continent.[936] This century would bring about the escalation and eventual culmination of tension between the northern and southern halves of the country, resulting in the emancipation of thousands of slaves. Beyond the world of politics, however, was the development of the Enlightenment in the nineteenth century. For the Princeton theologians, this constituted a very real threat to historic Christianity. As early as 1805, many conservative Christians in the U.S. were stunned by the appointment of a universalist to the Harvard divinity faculty, resulting in the establishment of Andover Theological Seminary a few miles away from Harvard's campus.[937] In the establishment of Princeton's seminary, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. approved a plan that "students were to be trained thoroughly in the Bible, learning to 'explain the principal difficulties which arise in the perusal of the Scriptures…from apparent inconsistencies…or objections arising from history, reason, or argument,' and being taught the main arguments of 'the deistic controversy' in order to become defenders of the faith."[938]

In addition to Andover's inauguration, Noll argues that Archibald Alexander's General Assembly sermon of 1808 sparked the church's desire to form a new body to train ministers. In his sermon, Alexander identified several "assaults of the enemy" upon the church of Christ. One that he believed had been abated was philosophical atheism, though he warned that the church should not rest should this issue reappear. Alexander

---

[936] It was, perhaps, more turbulent due to the outbreak of the American Civil War from 1861-5.
[937] M. Noll, "The Founding of Princeton Seminary," *Westminster Theological Journal*, 42 (1979), p. 77.
[938] *Ibid*., p. 80. These quotations come from the General Assembly's "The Plan of a Theological Seminary Adopted by the General Assembly … in their Sessions of May Last, A.D. 1811: Together with the Measures Taken by them to Carry the Plan into Effect" (Philadelphia, PA, 1811).

also presaged what may belie the church next: "From the signs of the times, I apprehend the danger to evangelical truth which will now arise will be from two opposite points: from what is called *rational Christianity*, and *enthusiasm*."[939] Alexander argued that "rational Christianity" can be found in nascent Socinianism and Unitarianism. This form does not worry Alexander much, though, as he believed that it "divest[ed] religion of all its awful and interesting attributes" with the result that the common person would not be interested in such religion. On the other hand, however, Alexander strongly cautioned his listeners to beware of overenthusiastic religion which "profess[es] to be guided by inspiration at every step."[940] The prescription for overly rational and/or enthusiastic religion is properly trained ministers, something which, according to Alexander, the PCUSA was sorely missing. Therefore, the founding of the seminary was, in many ways, a response to two problems in early nineteenth-century Christianity: a lack of properly trained, orthodox ministers and the expansion of Enlightenment thought. In response, the General Assembly – along with Alexander, Charles Hodge, and others – sought to provide a place of learning suited to meet the challenges.

Even at the earliest stages of the new seminary, Turretin's works were intimately involved. Alexander required that his students read the *Institutes* and recite some portions in class.[941] Like Calvin and Luther before him, Alexander appeared both to reproach the "schoolmen" while also appropriating their methods. In his *Lectures on Didactic Theology*, Alexander argued that theology went through a "dark period" between the early Church and the Reformation; this "dark period" was mostly the fault of

---

[939] A. Alexander found in Noll, *Princeton Theology*, p. 53. Author's emphasis.
[940] *Ibid*.
[941] L. Loetscher, *Facing the Enlightenment and Pietism: Archibald Alexander and the Founding of Princeton Theological Seminary* (Westport, CT and London, 1993), p. 189.

the "schoolmen."[942] However, Alexander's theology was organised in the standard scholastic order which he admits was common among the "schoolmen," but also, importantly, amid the "most systematic writers among Protestants."[943] Indeed, it is clear that Alexander, along with the other Princeton theologians, inherited certain presuppositions concerning theology, often coming from Turretin and other Protestant scholastics.[944] Sloan notes that Alexander's adherence to the Bible as an authoritative document for the Church was received from the likes of Turretin.[945]

It is not surprising, though, that the Princeton theologians would look to the past for answers about the present, as many of the troubles were the same. One set of challenges Alexander faced was of similar stock to those that faced Turretin, namely predestination, election, and the divine decrees. In an essay published in 1846, Alexander sought to explain these problems.[946] He wrote, "Persons thus introduced into a particular church, are often much perplexed and offended at some of the doctrines which they sometimes hear preached, and which they find in the creed of the society to which they have attached themselves: particularly, they are apt to stumble at the doctrine of *predestination* and *election*, as held by Calvinists."[947] Alexander believed that much of the problem lay in the ambiguity with which many theologians, ministers and laypersons explained predestination. Most people could not understand how an event could be simultaneously necessary and voluntary; that is, how a person could be forced to do a certain action

---

[942] *Ibid*., p. 191. Sloan correctly notes that this was a common thread among Protestants in the nineteenth century. It is important to recognise, though, that Turretin did not have the same prejudice. Rather, he argued against the writings of the "Papists," not necessarily including theologians of the late Middle Ages.
[943] *Ibid*., p. 190.
[944] *Ibid*., p. 230.
[945] *Ibid*.
[946] A. Alexander, "The Decrees of God," in *Theological Essays Reprinted from the Princeton Review* (New York, NY and London, 1846), pp. 60-79.
[947] *Ibid*., p. 61.

while also being culpable for the said action. Alexander believed that many people simply did not understand what 'voluntary' meant, confusing it with spontaneous. The two are not synonymous, however, as spontaneity, in his estimation, entailed randomness, or, at least, the opposite of necessity. Voluntary, though, does not entail this disjunction. He used the example of a person "actuated by no other feeling towards another but malice."[948] One could rightly assume that this person, due to his nature, would have no other option than to act maliciously if presented with it as a choice. It would, therefore, be necessary, but also voluntary.

Similarly, Alexander differentiated between certainty and necessity. He argued that many cannot conceive of a person's action being free if it is certain that it will happen and cannot occur in any other way. However, Alexander contended that an action unobserved by anyone (that is, an action that is not at least partially certain due to someone, namely God, observing or predicting its occurrence) cannot exist. "For what action ever occurs, of the existence of which beforehand, there may not be a probability in the view of some one?"[949] Alexander took it a step further, though, attempting to understand its moral character. An action's certainty is irrelevant to its moral integrity, according to Alexander – after all, is not an action completely certain after it occurs and yet its moral character not diminished? The morality of an action is not rescinded simply because it is certain; rather, moral actions are good or evil in their nature. In both of these aspects, volition and certainness, Alexander has explicated his prolegomena. For him, in this instance, it is impossible to discuss predestination without first defining the

[948] *Ibid*., p. 65.
[949] *Ibid*., p. 66.

terms. Alexander's prolegomena, however, are not couched in Aristotelian scholasticism, as Turretin's were, but in Scottish Common Sense philosophy.

Scottish Common Sense philosophy is a variegated tradition, though it is clear that it developed in the eighteenth-century Scottish universities by prominent philosophers such as Francis Hutcheson (1694-1746) and Thomas Reid (1710-96).[950] According to Ahlstrom, Common Sense philosophy can be summed up by Reid's four major conclusions:

> I. Philosophy depends on scientific observation, with the primary object of such observation being self-consciousness and not the external behaviour of other men.
> II. The observation of consciousness establishes principles which are anterior to and independent of experience. Some principles, like that of substance or cause-and-effect, are *necessary*, others, like the existence of things perceived, are *contingent*, but all are in the very constitution of the mind and not the product of experience.
> III. Nothing can be an efficient cause in the proper sense but an intelligent being; matter cannot be the cause of anything but is only an instrument in the hands of a real cause.
> IV. The first principles of morals are self-evident intuitions; moral judgments, therefore, are not deduced from non-moral judgements, for they are not deductions at all.[951]

Common Sense philosophy emigrated to the United States, partially, through John Witherspoon (1723-94), the future president of the College of New Jersey, now known as Princeton University.[952] Witherspoon brought with him the writings and philosophy of Reid; Ahlstrom contends that Reid "supplanted" George Berkeley (1685-1753) as the

---

[950] S. Ahlstrom, "The Scottish Philosophy and American Theology," *Church History*, 24 (1955), pp. 259-60.
[951] *Ibid*., p. 261. Ahlstrom cites a variety of works by Reid to determine these four precepts.
[952] *Ibid*., pp. 261-2. Sloan argues that Witherspoon was already at the height of his career when he accepted the Princeton job after much consideration. Witherspoon was picked, in part, because he was a middle voice between the "Old" and "New" school factions in late eighteenth-century American education: D. Sloan, *The Scottish Enlightenment and the American College Ideal* (New York, NY, 1971), pp. 103-4.

primary philosopher of Princeton.[953] A student of Witherspoon's, the Reverend William Graham, instilled Alexander with Common Sense ideas during his primary schooling.[954] In fact, Ahlstrom argues that the Scottish philosophy was as integral to the Princeton theology as Turretin himself.[955] Its importance is noted in two of his previously discussed notions of morality and necessity: 1) morality is self-evident in the intrinsic nature of the action, not in the external understanding of the individual; and 2) that some beings and actions are necessary and not contingent upon the will or work of anything outside of God. Both of these principles are found in Common Sense philosophy and in Alexander's prolegomena to predestination.[956] Particularly, Common Sense philosophy's tendency to stress the "self-evident", or obviousness, of a concept in human experience is what one can see in Alexander's prolegomena.

Alexander's argument concerning the divine decrees rests on God's omnipotence. Working on the basis of his prolegomena, Alexander contended that the main problem confronting the church's opposition to predestination is God's certain knowledge, and even decree, of all actions man can and will make. In order to avoid God's omniscience, Alexander asserted that there are only two options: voluntary and involuntary ignorance. In the former, one would argue that God does not know, voluntarily, all the options a free person has when making a decision. In philosophy, these are referred to as "conditionals" – actions that could have occurred had a person with free will chosen to do

---

[953] Ahlstrom, "Scottish Philosophy," p. 262.
[954] Noll, *Princeton Theology*, p. 13.
[955] Ahlstrom, "Scottish Philosophy," p. 266.
[956] It becomes necessary here to note that Common Sense philosophy was not limited to the Reformed or even conservative denominations of nineteenth-century Scotland and America. Ahlstrom notes that the Unitarian Harvard University was steeped in Common Sense realism. Therefore, much like the scholasticism of the seventeenth century, in which the Reformed, Lutheran, and Roman Catholic traditions utilised various aspects, so too did the Revolutionary and Civil War era Americans use Common Sense philosophy to prove their theology: see *Ibid*., pp. 262-3.

them.[957] Alexander stated that many theologians during his time proposed that God *could* have knowledge of conditionals, but he chooses not to know them in order not to infringe upon the free will of the individual. In the latter case, involuntary ignorance, Alexander wrote, "According to this, God neither proposed anything respecting the free actions of moral agents, nor was it possible for him to know what they would be."[958] Again, this argument would be grounded, incorrectly in Alexander's view, on the idea that if it is foreknown then it is certain and if it is certain then it is not free. These contentions point to a similar problem that Turretin faced: who, in this scenario, is culpable for sin? Alexander admitted as much when he wrote, "And therefore that being who decrees an event, and provides for its accomplishment, must, in all reason, be considered the proper cause of it, which, when the object of the decree is a sinful action, must lead to the blasphemous consequence, that God is the author of sin."[959]

Alexander answered this contention in a few ways: first, he acknowledged that it is possible for God to have immutably decreed that there be free agents. That is, God could have certainly decreed free agents without impugning their freedom because it is certain; this, he believed, is not theologically or philosophically absurd. He goes on to admit, however, that this does not solve the problem of free agents and certain actions decreed by God. He has two answers to this objection: first, the Aristotelian separation of causes. It is certain that God is the efficient cause of all actions, as he is the efficient cause of the whole universe by nature of his immutable will. Alexander appealed to the "schoolmen"

---

[957] A clearer definition of a conditional is this: "An item is a conditional if it is expressed by an English sentence consisting of "If" followed by an English sentence followed by 'then' followed by an English sentence." Of course conditionals are not contingent upon English, but the definition illustrates the common attributes of a conditional as an "if/then" statement in English: see J. Bennett, *A Philosophical Guide to Conditionals* (Oxford, 2003), p. 3.
[958] Alexander, "Decrees of God," p. 67.
[959] *Ibid*., p. 71.

and "Calvinistic theologians of former days" for his authority.[960] Alexander, however, denied that such an efficient cause impugns God. His argument for such a position comes from his Common Sense understanding of the world. He wrote: "By the works of creation we prove conclusively, that God is wise, and powerful, and benevolent, because we can see manifest indications of these attributes in the creature. We do not, indeed, conclude from such reasoning, that there is a perfect resemblance in the thing made to the Creator, which is impossible; but we legitimately infer from effects which could not be such as they are, unless their cause was powerful, wise, and benevolent."[961] In the same way, because an agent sins does not mean that the Creator of the sinner is, himself, a sinner. This, of course, would be antithetical to Christian theology. Rather, the logical (and more likely case) is that God, in his infinite wisdom, ordained a world in which sin would be permitted in order to attain a greater goal. This, in Alexander's view, is harmonious with a moderate Arminian, who would desire to affirm God's attributes of omniscience and omnipotence while also maintaining God's freedom from sin.

When comparing Alexander to Turretin, one begins to see obvious parallels. It is true, however, that similarly to the methodological difference between Calvin and Turretin, Alexander's methodology is distinctly different. The most obvious difference is the *quaestio* format that Turretin employs is absent in Alexander. Unlike Turretin, but similar to Luther, Alexander did not develop a "systematic theology." Therefore, Turretin's *Institutes* are more carefully ordered and explained. It is important to remember, though, that difference in methodology does not entail difference in thought, as evidenced by the clear continuity between Calvin, Beza, Turretin, and other Reformed

[960] *Ibid*., p. 73.
[961] *Ibid*., p. 74.

theologians. In fact, this difference in methodology, but similarity in conclusions, often illustrates more clearly the constancy within the tradition. One of the most obvious examples of this between Alexander and Turretin is their use of objections.

As illustrated above, Alexander argued that those who are against certainty in providence only have two options: God is either voluntarily or involuntarily ignorant of future events. Not surprisingly, Turretin provided the same alternatives in his section on providence.[962] Turretin wrote, "Finally, if free actions do not depend upon God and are not governed by him, they would be performed, God being either ignorant and unconscious or neglecting or unwilling (which cannot be said and thought without impiety)."[963] Indeed the similarities grow even stronger when one places this sentence in context. In *quaestio* three, "the object of providence," Turretin provided a fuller explanation than Alexander eventually will concerning voluntary and free will. In Turretin's framework, the question arises due to the theological conundrum of allowing for the omnipotent will of God and the free will of man. Turretin claimed that many, in their quest to harmonise the two, have "shut [providence] up in too narrow limits."[964] In contrast, Turretin explained that God is in control, through his providential decree, of all things, great or small. He has two articles of evidence for this position: God's attributes and scripture. In the former, Turretin simply explained that "God created all things, therefore he also takes care of all things." In the latter, Turretin illustrated a pattern in the Old and New Testaments of God's sovereign control over the smallest items. For

---

[962] *Elenctic Theology*, I pp. 489-538.
[963] *Ibid*., I pp. 500-1.
[964] *Ibid*., I pp. 497-8. Turretin, interestingly, names those who have narrowed the doctrine. He claims the "Peripatetics" have narrowed providence to only the heavenly realm, while the Pelagians extend providence to the universe, but not to humanity. Most importantly, Turretin implicated Thomas Aquinas in the latter due to Thomas's reluctance to extend providence to the minute aspects of life.

instance, Luke 12 states that God knows even the number of hairs upon a person's head; due to God's knowledge and control of the smallest elements of life it follows *a fortiori* that God is in control of the greatest. In Turretin's words, "If it was not unworthy of the majesty of God to create even the meanest and smallest things because they contribute to the greater demonstration of his wisdom and the perfection of the universe in so great a variety of creatures, why should it be derogatory to his glory to conserve them?"[965]

This, in many ways, is Turretin's explanation of necessity and certainty in God's providence. Much like Alexander, Turretin admitted that voluntary and free things are within humanity's power; that is, humans do have a free and voluntary will. This will, however, is under the control of providence.[966] Both scripture and reason speak to this. After naming several verses of the Bible, Turretin continued his argument by appealing to reason. Turretin's argument is one from ontology: humanity's being is grounded in God and, therefore, so are the actions of its will. But this grounding is not limited to conservation only. God does not simply sustain the universe that he created. Rather, God's providence acts in both primary and secondary causes, giving them their movement. Here Turretin was keen to separate the "orthodox" view from the heterodox. He claimed that the Jesuits and "some of the Romanists" asserted that God does not act in secondary causes. However, orthodoxy for Turretin was not confined to the Reformed; he was also willing to associate his theology with others Roman Catholics who he believed agreed with him in regard to primary and secondary causes. Contrary to his

---

[965] *Ibid*., I p. 499.

[966] Paul Helm makes a similar case concerning the relationship between Turretin and Jonathan Edwards on contingency and necessity. Though humanity participates as a secondary cause, "they are all contingent in that God could in his wisdom have decreed otherwise." P. Helm, "Francis Turretin and Jonathan Edwards on Contingency and Necessity" in J. Balserak and R. Snoddy (eds), *Learning from the Past: Essays on Reception, Catholicity, and Dialogue in Honour of Anthony N. S. Lane* (London, 2015), p. 171.

desire to differentiate himself from Aquinas earlier, here Turretin appeals to the Thomists who insist that "the providence of God consists not only in the conservation of things, but also in the concourse of God; not indifferent and general, but particular and specific (by which it flows immediately into both cause and effect)."[967]

What we begin to see, then, is that like his differences in relation to Calvin, Turretin's theology is much more developed than Alexander's. There are a few reasons for this. First, Turretin's theology is self-consciously systematic. The *Institutes* employ a methodology designed to identify, differentiate, and explicate Reformed theology over-and-against competing theologies. Alexander, on the other hand, is not employing the same type of system. We will see in the next section that other Princeton theologians utilised systematic methodologies in a much clearer way than Alexander. Alexander's theology, though, was not intended to be as thorough. Second, Turretin's *Institutes* were intended to be an orthodox Reformed statement in a period of continued denominational proliferation. As we saw in the previous chapters,[968] Turretin's *Institutes* were intended to persuade the councils of Geneva to accept Reformed orthodoxy as the way forward. Therefore, it was necessary for Turretin to use the methods of the Roman Catholics and others in such a way as to convince them of his exactitude. While there is some indication that Alexander's writings were a way of convincing as well,[969] it is more natural to understand his writings as explanatory as opposed to persuasive. He was utilising the *Institutes* in a way that spoke to his cultural framework.

---

[967] *Ibid*., I p. 502.
[968] Ch. 4, pp. 194-201.
[969] Especially if one places these writings in the context of understanding Princeton seminary's mission, as stated above.

After Alexander's death in 1851, the most famous of the Princeton theologians became chair of theology: Charles Hodge. Hodge's historical reputation, much like Turretin's, has been complicated. As a member of the "Old School" Presbyterians at the time of the Civil War, Hodge and his contemporaries have not fared well when analysed through a post-slavery lens.[970] One primary tenet of Hodge and the Old School Presbyterians was their insistence that the Southern states had misunderstood the North, "which was not in fact thoroughly abolitionist."[971] Hodge's apathy towards abolition, coupled with the view that his understanding of biblical inerrancy was incompatible with the historic Christian faith,[972] produced a twentieth-century historiography that consigned

[970] Wood mentions this when he notes Hodge's complicated view of slavery in general. Much of the secondary literature surrounding Hodge has implicated him as being complacent towards slavery because he also owned slaves: J. Wood, "The 1861 Spring Resolutions: Charles Hodge, the American Union, and the Dissolution of the Old School Church," *Journal of Church and State*, 47 (2005), p. 376.

[971] It is important to point out, though, that the Presbyterians did not split in anticipation of the Civil War and Hodge and others were instrumental in promoting unity in the church regardless of the division in politics. *Ibid*., pp. 276-7.

[972] The most prominent examples of the negative interpretation of the views on scripture of Hodge and others come from Ernest Sandeen, Jack Rogers and Donald McKim. Sandeen argues that, contrary to the Westminster Confession's doctrine of the infallibility of scripture due to the Holy Spirit's witness in the life of the believer, Hodge's view "substituted a doctrine of inspiration for the witness of the Holy Spirit." Sandeen's mistake here is to define the parameters of influence far too narrowly. There is no doubt that Hodge and the Princetonians valued the Westminister Confession, but it was hardly the only, or even central, avenue of influence. The Rogers and McKim thesis largely makes the same mistake, arguing that, beginning with the Reformed orthodox in the seventeenth-century, the "central Christian tradition" of biblical authority was distorted to an unprecedented degree. Rogers and McKim go on to argue for a clear break between Turretin and "other, more authentic, Reformation sources" such as the Westminster Confession. Woodbridge's key argument against Rogers and McKim is their omission of the historical context of the Princetonians. Woodbridge rightly illustrates that discussion about the infallibility of scripture was rampant in the colonies from the very beginning and found in some of the most prominent writings of theologians like Jonathan Edwards. For Sandeen's argument, see E. Sandeen, "The Princeton Theology: One Source of Biblical Literalism in American Protestantism," *Church History*, 31 (1962), p. 311 and *idem*, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930* (Chicago, IL and London, 1970), pp. 103-31; for Rogers and McKim, see J. Rogers and D. McKim, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach* (San Francisco, CA, 1979), pp. 274-98. Both Noll and Wood disagree with Sandeen and Rogers and McKim, but the most in-depth rebuttal to Rogers and McKim is J. Woodbridge, *Biblical Authority: A Critique of the Rogers/McKim Proposal* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1982), p. 121. Additionally, Woodbridge and Randall Balmer analysed the Sandeen thesis in J. Woodbridge and R. Balmer, "The Princetonians and Biblical Authority: An Analysis of the Ernest Sandeen Proposal," in D.A. Carson and J. Woodbridge (eds), *Scripture and Truth* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1983), pp. 251-79.

the Princetonians to "oblivion."[973] Recent studies concerning the Princetonians and Hodge are beginning to reinterpret this era in its proper context. What has become undisputable in recent historiography is Turretin's impact upon Charles Hodge.[974]

In Dennison's estimation, three thousand students who enrolled at Princeton Seminary during Alexander's and Hodge's careers were weaned on Turretin's *Institutes*. Additionally, it was Hodge who prompted George Musgrave Giger to translate the Latin *Insitutes* into English, producing the most thorough edition ever printed.[975] One primary example of Hodge's reliance on Turretin is in his doctrine of accommodation.[976] The doctrine of accommodation, simply put, is how God relates to humanity. For many, God "condescends" or "accommodates" human limitations in his revelation, allowing for factual errors within the biblical canon without implicating the Bible's claim to inerrancy. Here Mark Rogers makes some strong points concerning Hodge's implementation of scholastic methodology, including the aforementioned *ordo salutis*.[977] Even more pertinent to our overall discussion on the continuity of the Reformed Tradition, is Rogers's illustration of how Turretin's prolegomena on theology complements Calvin's:

> In addition to teaching the same general concept of accommodation as Calvin, Turretin also used some of the same metaphors as Calvin and the early church. For example, he

---

[973] Noll, *Princeton Theologians*, p. 41.
[974] Of Turretin, Hodge wrote: "His adherence to the received doctrine of the Reformed Church is so uniform and strict, that there is no writer who has higher claims as an authority as to what that doctrine was": Rogers and McKim, *Authority and Interpretation*, p. 281.
[975] J. Dennison, "The Life and Career of Francis Turretin," in *Elenctic Theology*, III pp. 639-48.
[976] M. Rogers, "Charles Hodge and the Doctrine of Accommodation," *Trinity Journal*, 31 (2010), pp. 225-42. Rogers argues that Hodge's two main influences were Turretin and Scottish Common Sense realism, as noted above.
[977] Hodge adds considerably to Turretin's system, though. Turretin's prolegomena only included sections on "Theology" and the "Holy Scriptures." Hodge's, on the other hand, are "On Method," "Theology," "Rationalism," "Mysticism," "Roman Catholic Doctrine Concerning the Rule of Faith," and "The Protestant Rule of Faith." After all this, totalling nearly two hundred pages, Hodge embarks on "Theology Proper" with the "Origin and Idea of God": C. Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (3 vols, Grand Rapids, MI, 1940).

> used Calvin's famous image of God lisping when discussing progressive revelation and the economic diversity of the covenant of grace: 'While [the church] was in infancy and had not reached maturity, it was to be treated as an infant…Thus God, as it were lisping, gave it the smallest measure of revelation.'[978]

Rogers's treatment of the connection between Calvin's and Turretin's use of accommodation does a good job of supplying the groundwork upon which to build.

In general, Hodge was never reluctant to mention the great theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries upon whom he relied. In light of the burgeoning German Higher Criticism of the nineteenth century, Hodge repudiated those who sought to dismantle the foundations of the Reformation.[979] "The system of the Reformers," he wrote, "was not only a great advance upon that which is superseded, but was vastly superior to that which would now displace it."[980] Hodge was quite liberal with his praise, however, not limiting his approval to Calvin or Luther. He positively identified Melanchthon and Vermigli's *Loci Communes* as far superior to anything being produced out of Germany during his time and he even suggests that he would prefer Arminius over the "misty generalities of the ablest modern syncretist."[981] His most biting criticism of late nineteenth-century theologians is their inability to explicate. The theologians of the Early Modern period may have had many faults, according to Hodge, but vacillating was

---

[978] Rogers, "Charles Hodge and Accommodation," p. 233.
[979] Rogerson defines biblical criticism as, "the attempt to study the Bible as rational beings using all the linguistic, archaeological and historical data available." Criticism is divided into lower and higher criticism, with the key difference between higher criticism and lower criticism being the idea that higher criticism does not allow the confessional limitations of the various denominations to impact its conclusions. This is a far too shallow definition, as Rogerson admits, but it gives a good indication of the presuppositions between the two schools of thought and why Hodge would have viewed it as being too obscure: J. Rogerson, "Biblical Criticism," in R. Coggins and J. Houlden (eds), *The SCM Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (London, 1990), pp. 83-6.
[980] Hodge found in Noll, *Princeton Theologians*, p. 115.
[981] *Ibid*.

not one of them. It is clear, then, that Hodge, like Turretin, preferred theology that was well organised and well explained. But so far we have not examined Hodge's theology as it relates to Turretin; a task to which we must now turn.

Immediately upon reading Hodge's section on providence in his highly influential *Systematic Theology* (1871-3), one can see Turretin's influence.[982] He wrote that providence does not only include God's sustaining of the universe, but it also overflows in his governance. This is a nearly word-for-word recitation of Turretin's *Institutes*. Indeed, Hodge even cites the same Bible verses to support his argument. For God's sustaining of all things, both Turretin and Hodge cite Nehemiah 9:6, Hebrews 1:3, and Psalm 104.[983] After establishing that providence is both a preservation and governance of the actions of creatures, both Turretin and Hodge analyse the state of opinions within their historical contexts. Though two hundred years apart, one finds surprising similarity. The first example discussed by both is what Hodge refers to as 'Deism.' He wrote, "First, that of those who assume that everything is to be referred to the original purpose of God. He created all things and determined that they should continue in being according to the laws which he impressed upon them at the beginning."[984] He used the analogy of God as a "mere spectator of the world" no longer intervening *efficiently* upon his creatures. God still acts secondarily as a product of his initial decree to create and sustain the cosmos; if he chose to, however, God could cease acting upon the universe causing its being to be negated.

---

[982] Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, I p. 557.
[983] Hodge also cites Colossians 1:17 and Psalm 148, while Turretin also appeals to Psalm 36 and Acts 17.
[984] Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, I p. 557.

Specifically, Hodge identified the Deists and the Remonstrants as proponents of this view. He objected to it on three grounds: first, it is against scripture. He has already noted the various verses that contradict the deistic view of God's providence and states that this is so evident from scripture that many philosophers have rejected Deism on biblical grounds. Second, it contradicts the dependent nature of all created beings. "It supposes," Hodge writes, "creatures to have within themselves a principle of life, derived originally, indeed, from God, but capable of continued being and power without his aid."[985] This is ontologically absurd to Hodge since God gave creatures their being, he, and he alone, can sustain it. Finally, this doctrine is simply against common sense; or, as Hodge states it, "This doctrine does violence to the instinctive religious convictions of all men."[986]

In a similar vein, Turretin identified Durandus and some of the Romanists as his first targets, claiming that they, too, adhere to a 'deistic' understanding of providence.[987] He writes, "They placed providence and the concourse of God only in this—that to the creature, previously made capable of acting, he merely conserves the strength and permits actions at pleasure (as if sufficient of itself to act alone)."[988] Unlike Hodge, however, Turretin does not immediately refute their arguments, instead turning to two other contemporary views. First, is the theology of the Jesuits, Remonstrants, and Socinians who all hold to an, essentially, Arminian view of providence. God's immediate work in creation is, often, in response to the acts of free creatures. This Turretin vigorously

---

[985] *Ibid*., p. 558.
[986] *Ibid*.
[987] It is important to note here that Turretin does not use the term "deist," but Hodge does. This is not surprising as Deism, in many ways, is a product of the Enlightenment.
[988] *Elenctic Theology*, I p. 501.

denies, arguing that it makes the primary cause (God) subordinate to secondary causes (creation). Finally, Turretin explains the views of the Thomists and Dominicans, with whom he agrees. He quotes Aquinas as saying, "When the free will moves itself, this does not exclude its being moved by another, from whom it receives the very power to move itself."[989] Turretin claims that Aquinas gives five examples of God's "concourse"—God's acting together with creation—1) God gives secondary causes the strength to act; 2) He sustains their "vigour" and "in being"; 3) he excites and applies secondary causes; 4) he determines them to act; and 5) he rules and directs them to accomplish his goals.[990] It is this fifth and final definition that Turretin prefers. God does not simply hold beings together: he accomplishes his ends through their acts.

It is here that Hodge goes in a different direction to Turretin. It is clear that in Hodge's case there is a greater variety of opinion and, therefore, a greater need to explain his position. The second opinion he deals with is what he refers to as "continuous creation." He identifies three main branches of this philosophy: first, are those who believe that creation and preservation are the same work. While not identifying any specific person or tradition, either positively or negatively, that adheres to this position, Hodge does not necessarily define the view solely by its flaws, instead preferring to identify why, from a philosophical standpoint, a Christian would adopt this view. He argues that this form of continuous creation attempts to keep God outside of time: "He cannot be viewed as acting in time, or as doing in time what He has not done from eternity."[991]

---

[989] *Ibid.*, I p. 502.
[990] *Ibid*.
[991] Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, I p. 558.

The second view in continuous creation is one that Hodge identifies with most Reformed theologians. It is the concept that all things have their being in God and without God's continued preservation they would cease to exist. He cites John Henry Heidegger,[992] Johann Heinrich Alsted (1558-1638), and Leonard Ryssenius (1636-1700) as positive advocates of this doctrine. The third, and final, view is that of total determinism in God: "As there was no cooperation in calling the world out of nothing, so there is no cooperation of second causes in its continuance and operations."[993] God is in total control of the universe and secondary causes, though perhaps philosophically possible, are not theologically possible due to God's complete sovereignty over all creation.

In response to these three views, Hodge elaborated on an orthodox position: that of *concursus*. This chapter has dealt with *concursus* only peripherally so far, and it now becomes necessary to elaborate. *Concursus*, simply put, is the proposition that God acts in concourse with creation. That is, when a secondary cause acts it is "concurred" through the divine will. This is not the same as cooperation, as that would entail God's willingness to "go along" with a creature's will. Rather, there is a concurring of action from the first cause to the second. *Concursus divinus* can be enacted in two different ways: first is mediate *concursus*, "such as God's gift of capacities to His creatures appropriate to the performing of certain tasks." Second is immediate *concursus*, or, "the direct dependence of man on God in the actual exercise of these capacities."[994] It is,

---

[992] See Ch. 1, p. 54 and Ch. 3, p. 133 (n. 427).
[993] Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, I p. 558.
[994] "Concursus Divinas," in F. Cross and E. Livingstone (eds), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (3rd ed., Oxford, 2005), p. 396. The author of the dictionary entry makes the mistake of claiming that *concursus divinus* was rejected by the Reformed. As I shall illustrate, Turretin had no problem and, in fact, preferred *concursus* as a way to explain God's work in providence.

therefore, a philosophically sophisticated way of understanding God's work in providence, while still allowing some degree of free will within humanity.

In response to the first example of continuous creation, Hodge argued that it is simply unscriptural to deny a difference between will and efficiency. For Hodge, God's power and God's action are separate. Additionally, to say that God cannot act in time what he did not act for all of eternity is absurd in human terms. Understanding God's eternal will is beyond the scope of humanity's cognitive abilities. For instance, God can work in time logically and from the perspective of humanity, without compromising his eternal work, as is evidenced through his creation of the universe bound by time. "We know, however, that God acts; that He does produce successive effects; and that, so far as we are concerned, and so far as the representations of scripture are concerned, our relation to God and the relations of the world to Him, are precisely what they would be if his acts were really successive."[995]

As an objection to the second premise, that of Heidegger and Rijssenius above, Hodge argued that one simply needs to separate the ideas of creation and preservation. Creation was *ex nihilo*; it was God's act to create out of nothing. Preservation, on the other hand, "is the upholding in existence of what already is."[996] Often, according to Hodge, theologians err in terms without necessarily erring in theology. They simply misattribute the words "creation" and "preservation" in their theology. However, when one truly expounds this idea, one errs egregiously. First, one errs in thinking that God's preservation is continuous *creatio ex nihilo*. The person simply does away with preservation in favour of continued creations. Second, it "destroys all evidence of the

[995] Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, I p. 560.
[996] *Ibid*.

existence of an external world." Every moment would be a new example of God's creative act and the external world, therefore, would be an illusion. Third, it abolishes secondary causes. God as the sole creator would be continuously recreating in the same manner as the act of creation in Genesis 1. Fourth, sin and holiness would not exist as, again, every action would only be a by-product of God's continuous creative effect. Finally, there would be no difference between Christianity and Pantheism as there would be no difference between God and creation.

In contrast to the two poles of Deism and Pantheism rest, according to Hodge, "the plain doctrine of the Scriptures." God, through his omnipotence, both created in a single act the whole universe, and now preserves all within it. These are two separate acts of God and to make them one is to lapse into heresy. Interestingly, Hodge actually chastised the theologians of the seventeenth century for being *too* thorough in their explanation of God's *concursus*. He argued that to analyse too meticulously leads to superfluous answers that humans were not intended to know. In the same way that the human does not understand "what way the soul is present and operative in the whole body, it requires little humanity to suppress the craving curiosity to know how God sustains the universe with all its hosts in being and activity."[997] He would have known, quite consciously, that one of the theologians he was criticising was Turretin, to whom we must now turn.

For Turretin, as usual, the theology of *concursus* in providence is illustrated in scripture. In this instance, Turretin utilises a highly literal hermeneutic in interpretation, citing God's "sending" of Joseph into Egypt in Genesis 45 and God's "using" the wicked

[997] *Ibid*., I p. 562.

as a rod in Isaiah 10. In his opinion, the writers of the Old Testament were not being figurative; God did, in concurrence with the secondary causes, do the work. One should not lapse into thinking that Turretin was a "literalist" interpreter of scripture in general, though. For instance, in Turretin's fifth topic, "On Creation," he argued that God's creation of the universe did happen in succession—it was not all created in a single moment from humanity's perspective. However, he was open to the possibility that the most literal interpretation of Genesis 1 and 2 is not necessary in orthodoxy.[998] He writes, "However, although he willed to spend many days in the work of creation, it cannot be inferred from this (as some wish) that God employed a whole day in the works of the particular days and so produced them successively."[999] Though it would be more natural, and literal, to assume God used a whole day in each successive act of creation, Turretin does not argue for this position, contending instead for a more philosophically sound explanation. One cannot uncritically assume, then, that Turretin was a "literalist" on all occasions.[1000]

In the case of *concursus*, then, Turretin was arguing for a literal understanding of God's "sending." From this interpretation, he extrapolated an extensive theology of

---

[998] It should be mentioned that my use of the term "literalist" is not intended in a negative sense, but rather descriptively for someone who interprets the historical books of the Bible in their most natural sense. For example, when the Genesis 1 account says that God created the universe in six days, a literalist would prefer to take this account at face value due to Genesis's historical genre.

[999] *Elenctic Theology*, I p. 445.

[1000] Turretin's hermeneutic is far more complicated than a simple figurative/literal dichotomy, though. He rejects the Roman Catholic fourfold view of interpretation (literal, allegorical, anagogical, and tropological), but proposes his own, which is surprisingly similar and, often, confusing. For instance, Turretin writes that scripture has but one sense of meaning, but that sense is twofold: "We thus think that only one true and genuine sense belongs to the Scriptures. That sense may be twofold: either simply or compound." The simple, however, is bifurcated further into proper and grammatical or figurative and tropological. His argument stems from the idea that the Roman Catholics have produced two separate interpretations which, often, are at odds with one another. His view, on the other hand, is that Scripture has but one proper interpretation, but the interpreter must utilise various methodologies in order to ascertain the true meaning: *Elenctic Theology*, I p. 150.

concursus. It is clear that Hodge's argument from ontology comes from seventeenth-century orthodoxy, as it, too, is found in Turretin. After beginning with scripture, Turretin's argument rests on creation's contingency upon God's being. Ontologically, creation is grounded upon the God in which creation is said "to live and move and have [its] being."[1001] A creature's working is a product of its being and, therefore, a product of the one who gave it being. Like Hodge, Turretin cannot, for fear of heterodoxy, exchange this order. God does not wait upon humanity's actions before he acts; this would cause God, the first cause, to become the second. Flowing from this argument is the idea that God, if he is not the first and concurrent cause, should not be prayed to for "he can neither avert evil nor confer good, unless just as it pleases men to determine the motion of God himself."[1002] The repercussions of this view are enormous for Turretin, for if God cannot avert evil nor confer good, then he is no longer the source of goodness in the universe nor would his actions be free. Rather, they would be subordinate to the ever-changing will of man. For Turretin, these views are "blasphemous" and "atheistical" and in the worst sense against the scriptures.

His final two proofs for *concursus* in providence are: first, God's sovereignty over even the smallest aspects of creation would be null and void and, finally, God's ultimate goals for creation, his *telos*, would be uncertain. In the former proof, Turretin, again, argues that the idea of God waiting upon human action before acting is totally unscriptural, as throughout the Old and New Testaments God is said to do miraculous acts on behalf of creation not in reaction to the actions of his creation. As to the latter, the subjugation of the divine will to the will of man would: 1) render the decrees of God

[1001] Turretin quotes Acts 17:28 and Colossians 1:17 here.
[1002] *Elenctic Theology*, I p. 503.

uncertain and his foreknowledge fallible due to human desire; 2) humanity's will would become separate to God's, leaving God dependent upon his "ally"; 3) creatures would be more active than God, who is subordinate to the actions of man; and 4) there would be no need to be pious or to rely on God. Turretin puts it pithily: "We could no longer say, 'If the Lord will, we shall do this or that (Jam. 4:15). Rather God (as if reduced to order) ought to say, 'If man wills to do, let this or that be done.'"[1003]

Much like Alexander, then, we see that Hodge was dependent upon his Reformed predecessors, especially Turretin. Though we cannot too narrowly ascribe influence to Turretin only, it is clear that Turretin's work is in the forefront of Hodge's mind, even to the point of avoiding Turretin, if necessary.[1004] For instance, when Hodge warns against over speculation, he is most certainly thinking about Turretin's theology of particular *concursus*. This is not to say that Hodge would have disagreed with Turretin, but, rather, it suggests that Hodge utilised Turretin to his advantage. Further, Hodge's clear lineage within the thought of Turretin and other Reformed scholastics illustrates that far from being a rigid and strict distorter of Calvin's theology, the Reformed scholastics were, decidedly, the preferred reference for clear Reformed thought. This, again, is not to say that Calvin was not an influential member of the Reformed Tradition, as Hodge often refers to himself and others as Calvinists.[1005] Instead, it illustrates that Reformed scholasticism was Calvinism for the nineteenth-century Princetonians.

[1003] *Ibid*., I p. 504.
[1004] Kennedy argues that Hodge may not have realised it when he departed from Turretin's views, but it seems very unlikely that a theologian of his calibre, who, at least in this section, addresses the faults of some Early Modern theologians would not have understood his departures: E. W. Kennedy, "From Pessimism to Optimism: Francis Turretin and Charles Hodge on 'The Last Things,'" in J. D. Klunder and R. L. Gasero (eds), *Servant Gladly: Essays in Honor of John W. Beardslee III* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1989), p. 108.
[1005] Hodge calls the Reformed "Calvinist" in *Systematic Theology*, I pp. 31, 136.

IV. Conclusion

What becomes clear, then, is that Turretin's impact upon later generations of Reformed theologians fluctuates. Though this analysis has been purposefully limited, it has shown that Turretin's influence extended as far as Civil War Era America and nineteenth-century Scotland. In Geneva, Turretin's immediate significance was limited. His son chose instead to chart a different path for the city, leading it towards plurality rather than orthodoxy. This caused the city that once belonged to Calvin to be opened to thinkers of various ideologies and beliefs. In Scotland, Turretin enjoyed mild resurgence in the writing of Leonardus Rijssenius and a new edition of his *Opera*. Additionally, Scottish ministers and theologians such as Thomas Boston carried Reformed scholasticism into rural Scotland. In the United States, however, it is evident that Turretin's impact was immediate. The Princeton theologians of the early and mid-nineteenth century consciously appealed to their seventeenth-century predecessors with great enthusiasm. Though they did not feel bound to Turretin's methods, nor his use of strict Aristotelian definitions, it is apparent that Archibald Alexander and Charles Hodge identified as 'Calvinist' in its fullest sense, including the Reformed orthodox of the post-Calvin period. Turretin, then, was far from a distorter of Calvinism; instead he was a prominent voice in the propagation of Reformed orthodoxy throughout the Western world.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

I. Summary of Findings

When Francis Turretin died in 1687, his nephew, Bénédict Pictet, eulogised "Farewell, most longed-for Turretin—'most beloved and marvellous person.' Farewell, soul received by heaven. We shall follow you by that order the fatal hour shall call each of us."[1006] Though clearly intended as a rhetorical and sentimental statement, Pictet's remark could not have been more correct. The life and theology of Turretin, though immediately rejected by eighteenth-century Geneva, was closely and consciously carried into the future of Protestantism through various ministers in a variety of global communities. This thesis has shown that, far from being an aberration within Protestantism and, more specifically, the Reformed Tradition, Turretin's theology and ethos as a minister in the canton stood in clear theological descent with those who began the evangelical movement in Switzerland.

In the Introduction, this project outlined several contentions that helped to re-contextualise the nature of Early Modern Protestantism and the development of Reformed theology in Geneva. Of particular concern for this research were the life and influences of Turretin, the impact of Turretin's work in Geneva, the delineation of Turretin's thought in comparison to other Early Modern Reformed theologians, particularly Calvin, and the impact of Turretin's ideas upon the Reformed Tradition after his death. Ultimately, this thesis sought to answer, "what was the impact of Francis

[1006] B. Pictet, "Funeral Oration of Benedict Pictet Concerning the Life and Death of Francis Turretin—Delivered on the Third Day of November of the Year 1687," in *Elenctic Theology*, III p. 676.

Turretin upon the Protestant Reformed Tradition?" These questions, though broad, required detailed historical and theological analysis in order to arrive at nuanced and original conclusions. Resisting many of the recent historiographical trends, this thesis has argued, it is hoped, persuasively, for a re-interpretation of Turretin's life in light of his historical context and theological contributions. Twentieth-century historiography concerned itself with rejecting Turretin's theology on the grounds that it did not comport with Calvin's original goal in reforming the Christian Church. Expanding the range of historical and theological sources, however, has provided the researcher with a clear trajectory in favour of including Turretin amongst the Reformed orthodox extending from Calvin to the late nineteenth century. Indeed, this thesis has shown, even more broadly, the lineage of orthodox Christian thought extending into the late Middle Ages and the Early Christian Church.

In order to demonstrate this conclusion adequately, I have provided, through the body of the thesis, the fruits of extensive research examining the important historiographical arguments, primary source documents, theological assertions, and important historical contexts. Beginning with the historiography on Turretin and the post-Reformation Reformed Church, this thesis argued that due to the limited sources provided in previous secondary works, and the biased nature of the analysis, Turretin's life, and the development of the Reformed Tradition after Calvin, required renewed consideration. Nineteenth- and twentieth-century historiography was primarily occupied with presenting the 'Calvin vs. the Calvinist' argument, which claimed that, beginning with Theodore Beza (1519-1605), the Reformed Tradition became corrupted from the original purity of Calvin's theology. Historians such as Brian Armstrong, R.T. Kendall and Basil Hall are

primary examples of this view.[1007] Of particular concern to those who sought to argue for a break from Calvin to his followers, was the use of scholastic methodology in systematic theology. Armstrong, amongst others, claimed that scholasticism was constrained by the use of Aristotelian logic in a way that Calvin's Humanism was not. Additionally, nineteenth-century historians, such as Heinrich Heppe and Hans Emil Weber, argued for a 'central dogma' theory, proposing that Reformed theology, beginning with Beza, privileged predestination over other theological *loci*.[1008] Beginning with Richard Muller in the 1980s, these theses began to be eroded.[1009] Muller's proposition is that, though there is a discontinuity of methodology, there is a continuity of theology. He does not deny that Calvin was a humanist and that Beza, and others, were scholastics; rather, he rejects the idea that methodological differences produced divergent conclusions.

What Muller and this thesis illustrate is that previous historians ignored the historical context in which post-Reformation theology emerged. Focussing instead upon the methods of theology, the 'Calvin vs. the Calvinist' historians presented post-Calvin 'Calvinism' as a system intent on promoting this *central dogma* through scholastic methodology. Though Beza and Turretin do elaborate on predestination more than Calvin did, it was due to their context within the polemical and confessional situation of Early Modern Europe. As Lutheranism, the Church of England, and post-Tridentine

---

[1007] *Amyraut Heresy*; R.T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (New York, NY, 1979); and B. Hall, "Calvin Against the Calvinists," in G.E. Duffield (ed.), *John Calvin* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1966), pp. 19-37.

[1008] H. Heppe, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformirten Kirche Deutschlands, Schriften zur reformirten Theologie* (Elberfeld, 1860); H. Weber, *Der Einfluss der protestantischen Schulphilosophie auf die orthodox-lutherishe Dogmatik* (Leipzig, 1908).

[1009] R. Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1986); *Idem*, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725* (4 vols, Grand Rapids, MI, 1987-93); *Idem*, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York, NY, 2003). These are but a few of his numerous contributions to the subject of post-Reformation historical theology.

Roman Catholicism continued to define their theologies vis-à-vis other Christian traditions, the orthodox Reformed of Geneva followed suit. This process required a clear and concise understanding of what differentiated the Reformed from the other Christian traditions and the preference of predestination in Reformed writing in the seventeenth century had more to do with necessity than partiality.

In the case of Turretin, this thesis sought to contextualise his theology in terms of the development of theology, politics, and methodology in the Reformed movement as a whole. This required, firstly, an understanding of the evolution of the Evangelical city and canton of Geneva. The canton, as Protestant Rome, exerted immense influence in the late sixteenth century. With the advent of the Synod of Dort and the progress of Reformed ecclesiology and theology in France, the Netherlands, Germany, Great Britain and the colonies of the New World, Geneva's influence began to wane in the course of the seventeenth century. These various nation-states had now solidified their places amongst the Protestant nations of Early Modern Europe. The French Reformed were thriving due to their indigenous expansion of universities and academies designed to train ministers. In the latter part of the sixteenth century, Geneva provided education and training to aspiring Reformed ministers from many nations and it exported Genevans to aid in the spreading of the Reformed gospel. In the seventeenth century, however, France, the Netherlands, and Great Britain had built or reformed their own universities to sustain their Reformed communities from within. Centres of education included Paris, Saumur, Amsterdam, Utrecht and Cambridge, amongst others. This meant that the Reformed Tradition in Early Modern Europe no longer needed a Protestant Rome, at least in terms of ecclesiastical training.

Chapters 2 and 3 provided the historical foundations for my argument. First, this thesis set the context of Turretin's work. Turretin was raised and trained in Geneva, an important city in Reformation and Early Modern history. Therefore, Geneva's place within the Protestant and, even more specifically, Reformed world of Early Modern Christianity was essential in understanding Turretin's theological context. Previous historiography had focussed almost entirely upon Geneva's place in Calvin's reformation. While enlightening to the historian of the sixteenth century, it was crucial for this thesis to expand the historical understanding to include seventeenth-century Geneva. Turretin's theology and ministry occurred more than one hundred years after Calvin's death, making assessments of Calvin's Geneva important, yet secondary to the need to grasp the state of the canton after his death.

Primarily, this thesis argued that Geneva's influence on Early Modern Europe waned after 1564. I argued this on two fronts: first, Reformed centres throughout Europe no longer required the Geneva Academy in order to train their ministers. The number of academies and universities increased during the seventeenth century, and it became common for communities to send their candidates to a local training centre. France had relied heavily on Geneva during the years preceding the Edict of Nântes. This mean that French Huguenots needed to send their Reformed ministers to be trained somewhere outside the jurisdiction of the French monarchy. When the French Reformed gained substantial rights under the Edict, though, they took advantage of them. Academies in Montauban, Nîmes, Paris and Saumur soon became important centres for Reformed thought in the seventeenth century. As Chapter 2 illustrated, this did not mean that *all* non-Genevans remained in their home country for training; rather, it illustrated the

evolution by which new Protestant communities determined their own course of development during this period.

This is particularly evident in the case of the Academy of Saumur, which helped develop the doctrine of Hypothetical Universalism. Professors such as Moses Amyraut and Josué de la Place proceeded to produce a rationale for why God's salvation would be limited to the elect only, yet still be able to assert that Christ's death was for all humanity. Many theologians in Geneva attempted to undermine this theology, but it became influential within the French Reformed and, ultimately, reached the Academy in Geneva. Had Geneva's influence been more prominent in the seventeenth century, it is reasonable to claim that Hypothetical Universalism would have been erased in the minds of the Early Modern Reformed. This was not the case, however, and Hypothetical Universalism would remain an important and polemical topic for Geneva for the remainder of the seventeenth century. Indeed, Geneva's importance for most of Early Modern Europe remained tangential during the seventeenth century. Geneva continued to send missionaries and ministers throughout the various nation-states, but it no longer held the centre as the Protestant Rome, at least pragmatically. Reformed parishioners may have viewed Geneva as the "city on a hill," but the leaders of the Reformed movements in France, Germany, the Netherlands, England, and colonies of the New World were able to provide for their communities from their indigenous populations.

In the city of Geneva, oligarchy had taken hold. Power had shifted to a few prominent families that served on the various civic and ecclesiastical councils. Even more specifically, civic power was consolidated in the Small Council, which was made up of eminent *bourgeoisie* families. On the ecclesiastical front, the Company of Pastors

held significant sway. When the controversies over Hypothetical Universalism and the signing of the *Helvetic Formula Consensus* were being fought, these two councils and the prominent Geneva families battled for the future of the city. Turretin, as a member of the *bourgeoisie* and of the Company of Pastors, held an eminent place on the council. My contention is that this oligarchical framework paved the way for a polemical exchange concerning the nature of "orthodox" Reformed thought. Because, as this thesis makes clear, the Hypothetical Universalists ultimately won the struggle in Geneva in the early eighteenth century, a historiography biased against Turretin and his party became entrenched. Only by understanding Turretin's place within this oligarchical and contentious context could a revised interpretation be proposed.

Turretin's biography, then, is situated within this scheme of developing factions. Turretin lived a life typical for a *bourgeoisie* person in seventeenth-century Geneva. After being trained at the Academy of Geneva, his wealth gave him the opportunity to tour the Protestant academies of Europe. Beginning in the Netherlands, Turretin surveyed the theological and ecclesiastical landscape of the Early Modern Reformed and returned to Geneva intent on providing theological and ministerial consistency in a context that was shaky, at best. Due to Turretin's prominence amongst the Reformed in Geneva, he was called upon to bring support to the Lyon Reformed community that was being torn apart by inner strife. Additionally, Turretin was asked by the councils of Geneva to go to the Low Countries on their behalf to request funds to refortify the city walls. Finally, it was Turretin who would eventually seek the unification of the Swiss cantons under a renewed *Consensus* designed to solidify what they believed was historic, Reformed orthodoxy.

It is clear, then, that far from being a divisive figure or a theologian intent on supplanting the irenic and agreeable theology of Calvin in favour of "rigid" scholasticism, Turretin emerges from chapter two in a new light, re-contextualised within the already adversarial situation of Reformed factions. Turretin certainly took a side in the debate, but he did not do this in order to subject Geneva and the Reformed to some sort of theological yoke from which they could never escape. Rather, Turretin's stature as an influential and distinguished name amongst the Reformed necessitated his participation within Genevan controversies. In fact, due to the canton's reliance upon Turretin in various other, non-ecclesial demands, it would have been strange for him not to become involved in a theological dispute no matter how "rigid" it may seem to modern historians.

It is against this historical background, then, that Turretin's influential *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* (1679-85) was analysed. Again, the *Institutes* has a problematic rendering in the historiography of Early Modern Reformed theology. In fact, many historians conflate the writings of Theodore Beza and *all* post-Calvin theologians into the same questionable analysis. Historians like R. T. Kendall, ignoring the situation of sixteenth and seventeenth century historical developments, argues that Beza distorted Calvin's work beyond recognition, charting a new path for Calvin's followers of which Calvin would not have approved.[1010] Even a cursory glance at Turretin's writings would prove this claim false. Furthermore, Muller has helped lead to a consensus that theology did not develop in a vacuum and that, often, a theological work must be analysed in light of its historical environment. This is why understanding Turretin's situation within Early

[1010] R. Muller, "The Use and Abuse of a Document: Beza's *Tabula Praedestinationis*, the Bolsec Controversy, and the Origins of Reformed Orthodoxy," in *Protestant Scholasticism*, pp. 33-61.

Modern Geneva, and his life as a whole, proved so essential. The *Institutes*, therefore, must be recognised as emerging from the theological polemics within the Reformed churches of Geneva and France and, more specifically, the arguments within the Academy of Geneva.

In view of this history, this thesis has argued that Turretin's main contention was that orthodoxy, as he saw it, was grounded in the historic Christian faith as evidenced throughout the whole of Christian history, not just the reforms of the sixteenth century. By analysing Turretin's work in contrast with Calvin's, this chapter helped dispel the "Calvin vs. the Calvinists" hypothesis. It is true that Calvin and Turretin did not share methods, as Calvin was primarily a humanist and Turretin a scholastic. However, simple methodological differences do not entail theological divergence. Calvin's and Turretin's doctrines of predestination, for instance, are strikingly similar. If one were to assume a discontinuity between Calvin and the Reformed following him, then this is a surprising conclusion. As a result of the historical and theological developments discussed in this chapter, though, one can readily see why there would be a connection.

Turretin's reliance on scholastic methodologies has been contentious, as well. Yet, if one understands the trajectory of his education, it is clear why he utilised scholasticism instead of humanism. Turretin's time at the Academy was a time of scholastic instruction. One of his main sources of inspiration, Friedrich Spanheim, was thoroughly scholastic and Turretin studied under him during his time in Geneva, as well as, his excursion to the Low Countries during Spanheim's tenure at the academy in Leiden. As argued in Chapter 4, Turretin's reliance upon Spanheim is evident in his *prolegomena* on theology. *Prolegomena* are intrinsic to scholastic theological systems and Turretin

inherited this practice from Spanheim, who, in turn, inherited it from Medieval theologians, such as Thomas Aquinas and Johannes Duns Scotus. Therefore, Turretin's methodology was wholly in accord with theological development in the late Medieval and Early Modern periods and, in many ways, the humanistic theology of Luther and Calvin emerges as an innovation in contrast with their forbears.

Furthermore, methodology does not necessarily entail divergent conclusions. For instance, as illustrated above, Turretin's placement of the doctrine of predestination was wholly congruent with late-Medieval scholasticism and his training within an academic institution of Early Modern Europe. Calvin's placement of predestination so late in his *Institutes* was due more to his education in humanist scholarship. Calvin was never formally schooled in theology and, therefore, was not influenced by his instructors in favour of scholasticism. But, again, this difference is superficial, at best; it does not follow that variant conclusions will emerge simply because the methodology alters.

The content of Turretin's theology also illustrates his self-understanding as "one amongst the Reformed." Again, many have argued that post-Reformation theologians set the Reformed Tradition on a path that was antithetical to Calvin's original intent. That is, Calvin aimed to put scripture back at the forefront of theology, allowing for grey area in matters not essential for salvation. This was especially the case in the arguments concerning predestination. Calvin, according to much twentieth-century historiography, placed the doctrine of predestination deep within his *Institutes* in order to illustrate its minor importance for the Reformed. Unlike Calvin, Beza and his orthodox Reformed successors brought it forward into the doctrine of God, giving predestination a similar standing, theologically, as the doctrine of creation. Again, Muller pioneered the re-

examination of this thesis when he challenged the assumptions made by Kendall, Hall and Armstrong concerning Beza's *Tabula Praedestinationis*, arguing that, "The primary basis for a right understanding of the *Tabula* must be consideration of its genre and purpose in its historical context, not the purpose to which it might be directed by nineteenth-century theologians in search of their own central dogmas."[1011] This statement highlights the importance of understanding Turretin's historical context before analysing the content of his theology: placing theology in a historical vacuum distorts our capacity to assess its original purpose.

So what was the purpose of Turretin's *Institutes*? Primarily, this thesis has argued that Turretin's goal was to persuade the oligarchical government of Geneva to side with his version of orthodoxy over and against the theology of the Hypothetical Universalists. By placing the writing of the *Institutes* within the polemical atmosphere of seventeenth-century Geneva, one can readily see its function as a persuasive *opera* for the Reformed Tradition. Though the book is extensive and detailed, Turretin advised his readers that his "little work" was not intended to be a "full and accurate system of theology."[1012] Rather, Turretin hoped that he would be able to answer the "primary falsehoods"[1013] of his theological opponents in Geneva and greater Early Modern Europe. Of course, this programme was not limited to the Hypothetical Universalists, as Turretin readily addressed "falsehoods" present in Lutheranism, Catholicism, Socinianism, and Arminianism, the last with fervency. One should understand this context when analysing Turretin's *Institutes*. Taken alone, one could argue that it is more combative than

[1011] *Ibid*., p. 61.
[1012] *Elenctic Theology*, I p. xl.
[1013] *Ibid*., I p. xxxix.

Calvin's *Institutes* and, therefore, a more "rigid" system. Recognising Turretin's purpose within this tumultuous period, though, it is possible to appreciate the document as intending to elaborate on (and defend) orthodox Reformed theology, as Turretin understood it, as opposed to the competing interpretations traversing the European landscape.

When one investigates deeper into the content of the theology, though, the similarities between Calvin and Turretin's doctrines of predestination quickly become apparent. Both Calvin and Turretin urged the preaching of predestination from the pulpit, that it is plainly taught in scripture, and that it decrees both the elect and the reprobate. Even more, both Calvin and Turretin warned against over speculation *and* under speculation. One could err too modestly in assuming predestination should not be preached. It is clearly elaborated in scripture, so why would the godly minister willingly avoid it? Turretin's and Calvin's reliance on scripture dispels the idea that post-Reformation theologians had abandoned scripture in favour of Aristotelian philosophy. Certainly, Turretin utilised Aristotle when appropriate, but he was more than willing to allow scripture to speak for itself. Though it is true that Turretin's doctrine of predestination comes under the *locus* of the divine decrees and not under salvation, as Calvin placed it, it is a mistake to assume that this means disunity between Calvin and his "followers." The material in Turretin's *Institutes* can settle this debate: unity in content, though discontinuity in terms of methodology.

Moving on from the *Institutes*, one of this thesis's most important contributions to knowledge is in expanding the analysis of Turretin's theology into his academic, pastoral, and confessional writings. In terms of Turretin's academic writing, one can readily

discern his place within the scholarly communities of Early Modern Europe. Primarily, Turretin's academic writings are disputations, treatises written in response to students or professors in order to earn an academic degree. The subjects of these disputations ranged from the "Satisfaction of Christ" to the "Necessity of Secession from the Church in Rome." As with the *Institutes*, Turretin's disputations contain elaborate theology and philosophy grounded in biblical exegesis. The disputations, then, buttress the argument that Turretin, like the evangelical and Reformed before him, relied on scripture much more than was previously believed. Furthermore, one can see that Turretin's use of scholastic methodology was not a detriment to his reliance on scripture. His disputations are scholastic in method, yet, like the *Institutes*, scripture and tradition reign supreme. This conclusion is consistent with their academic and persuasive natures, much like the purpose of the *Institutes*.

In contrast, Turretin's sermons are almost devoid of scholastic methods and distinctions. These texts tend towards a Christological focus, intent on conveying to his parishioners the importance of Christ's salvific work on the cross. Turretin's exegetical prowess is on display in his sermons in ways that are not evident in the *Institutes* or in his disputations. He elaborated on a small section of scripture, utilising Old and New Testament passages to illuminate the selected verse's ultimate, existential meaning for his listeners. This meaning took two forms: mental and practical. Turretin's sermons were intended to impact the Christian in meaningful ways. Mentally, Christians were meant to reconsider themselves in light of Christ's work; practically, they were meant to repent and re-examine their lives as members of Christ's Church. Again, these previously unexamined sermons exemplify Turretin's ability to speak on the basis of different

methods, depending on the context. He was not primarily concerned with preaching scholastic distinctions in the temples of Early Modern Europe. Rather, his work as a minister was consistent with the *ars praedicandi* of the post-Reformation world.

Finally, his work on the *Helvetic Formula Consensus* helps to illustrate what, exactly, Turretin, Heidegger and Gernler objected to in terms of Hypothetical Universalism. It also exemplifies what Turretin's primary concern in theology was: the preservation of God's sovereignty over all of creation. In his mind, Hypothetical Universalism, the abrogation of the divinity of the Hebrew vowel points, and the non-imputation of Adam's sin continued to annul God's work as sovereign Lord. The *Consensus* is a confessional document designed to simplify orthodoxy, as Turretin viewed it, into simple statements that the academic and civic communities in evangelical Switzerland could affirm. In it, we see very little scholasticism or a preoccupation with predestination. On the contrary, in the context of the polemics of Early Modern Geneva, Turretin, Heidegger and Gernler focussed their attention on three aspects of heterodox thought that, in their minds, nullified the theology of the Reformed.

After analysing Turretin's history and theology, this thesis proceeded to elaborate on his posthumous impact upon the Reformed in Europe, the United Kingdom, and the United States. In Geneva, the *Consensus* was quickly repealed in favour of a more 'tolerant' academic ethos. Turretin's son, J. A. Turretin, led the effort to quash the *Consensus*, succeeding in 1725. As McNutt notes, due to the revocation of the Edict of Nântes, the Reformed in Geneva could no longer afford such elaborate divisions in the midst of persecution.[1014] Turretin's influence was limited, primarily, to the publication of

[1014] J. P. McNutt, *Calvin Meets Voltaire: The Clergy of Geneva in the Age of Enlightenment, 1685-1798* (Farnham, 2013), p. 287.

the *Institutes* in Geneva and the Low Countries, and the ministry of his nephew, Bénédict Pictet. Turretin's impact in Geneva, then, was surprisingly limited due to the abrogation of the *Consensus* and the death of the 'old guard' orthodox theologians and ministers.

In the United Kingdom, Turretin had more influence, though, at times, it was not explicit. Principally, Turretin's importance is evidenced in Leonardus Rijssenius's re-publication of the *Institutes* in a truncated form and without proper attribution. Rijssenius's work was utilised at the University of Edinburgh throughout the eighteenth century and with the intention of training the young schoolmen of Scotland. In addition, a Scottish edition of Turretin's *Institutes* was published in 1847-8. Edinburgh's growth as a publishing centre contributed to the argument that Turretin's work was influential within Scotland. However, Turretin's ultimate impact through these republications is difficult to discern as there is little evidence of print run; nor is it easy to discover which libraries contained copies of the *Institutes*.

Turretin's most conspicuous impact was in nineteenth-century America, mainly amongst the Princeton Theologians of Princeton Theological Seminary. Archibald Alexander and Charles Hodge, the first two "principal chairs" of theology at the Seminary, were deeply influenced by the works of Turretin. Much like seventeenth-century Geneva, nineteenth-century America was undergoing tumultuous change, especially amongst the confessional academic institutions. In response to the liberalising of the universities, Princeton Seminary was founded. Students were required to read Turretin's *Institutes* as a foundational text under both Alexander and Hodge. It was not until Hodge produced his own *Systematic Theology* that students were weaned off Turretin's theology. In terms of content, one can readily see Turretin's presence within

the writings of Alexander and Hodge. They both employed Aristotelian distinctions, this time through the use of Scottish Common Sense philosophy. In particular, by investigating their theologies of divine *concursus* one can see the ideological lineage running through the Reformed Tradition from Calvin to Turretin and then to the Princeton theologians. Ultimately, Turretin's influence upon later Reformed ministers and theologians is moderate. Though his thought is perpetuated, at times it is unknowingly so.

What this thesis has demonstrated is that Turretin's life, and the development of Reformed theology, must be analysed within the context of Early Modern Europe. I have argued that previous interpretations of post-Reformation Reformed history cannot be thought of in terms of a disjunction between the early reformers and their theological descendants. Turretin's work, in light of the polemics of Early Modern Geneva, shows that he aimed to persuade the councils and academies of that city to favour his understanding of Reformed orthodoxy. He attempted to place his writings in clear lineage with the early, medieval, and Reformation Christians who adhered to orthodox Christianity. In particular, Turretin was concerned with preserving God's sovereignty over his creation. Whether this was exemplified through his *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, disputations, sermons, or the *Helvetic Formula Consensus*, Turretin's goal was to conserve God's absolute control over the world and, in particular, the evangelical movement. In Turretin's mind, Hypothetical Universalism, the Roman Catholic Church, and Arminianism, amongst others, threatened the perpetuation of this doctrine amongst the Reformed. In the immediate aftermath of his death, Turretin's work of preserving orthodox Reformed doctrine was limited, as his son and others sought to abrogate the

Consensus within evangelical Switzerland. However, Turretin's theology infiltrated Scotland and the United States in a profound way, ensuring that new generations of Reformed ministers would be trained employing Turretin's understanding of being "one amongst the Reformed."

II. Suggestions for Further Research

In many ways, this thesis has opened up several new avenues for further study. As my research progressed, it became evident that there has been very little scholarly inquiry devoted to post-Reformation Reformed history and theology. Though post-Reformation studies have increased recently, Turretin has been primarily analysed in terms of his theological and philosophical presuppositions and not in terms of his historical situation. This is chiefly evident in the lack of research on the development of Geneva after Calvin, but before Voltaire. Robert Kingdon's work on Calvin's Geneva, especially concerning the Registers of the Consistory, has been invaluable, but it is limited to the mid-sixteenth century.[1015] It is imperative that scholarship expand this research to include the evolution of the city after Calvin, when heterodox theology continued to proliferate. This will help to contribute to a new understanding of the nature of Early Modern theology in light of the progression of nation building and the consolidation of city and national governments. This thesis has illuminated one aspect of Geneva's oligarchical rule and how it affected Turretin's method and ideology. Investigating the Registers of the Company of Pastors and the governing councils of Geneva throughout the seventeenth

[1015] R. Kingdon, *Registers of the Consistory of Geneva in the Time of Calvin* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2000).

century would help increase the knowledge of how post-Calvin Geneva implemented Reformed orthodoxy and how certain civic or social events shaped Reformed orthodoxy.

The contextualisation of Turretin's theology in terms of the overall Reformed movement also needs to carry on. As Reformed theology continued to develop throughout Early Modern Europe, Turretin's works will need to be compared and contrasted with more sources. That project will necessitate more archival research in order to recover neglected writings from other ministers and theologians within the city. For instance, important members of the Reformed community in Geneva, namely Phillip Mestrezat and Louis Tronchin, have not been properly explored. Much of the analysis centred on their work is from secondary sources. Hypothetical Universalism and its impact upon Geneva has been evaluated on the basis of the Registers of the Company of Pastors and historians who postdate the events by several decades. Filling this lacuna will, to a degree, help us to understand the debates concerning Hypothetical Universalism from the perspective of those who were arguing against Turretin without the bias, whether positive or negative, of an intermediary. These are only two ways in which this thesis has pointed to new avenues of research that are essential in order to expand historians' understanding of the development of Early Modern Europe and the Reformed Tradition.

Appendix

List of Syndics of the Small Council of Geneva, 1650-99, in order of first election[1016]

Surname, First Name: Years Elected

Voisine, Jean: 1650, 1654, 1658, 1662, 1666, 1670, 1674

Dupan, Jacob: 1650, 1654, 1658, 1662, 1666, 1670, 1674, 1678

Dansse, Jaques: 1650

Sarrasin, Jean Antoine: 1650, 1654

Favre, Ami: 1651

Mestrezat, Domaine: 1651, 1655, 1659

Riller, Estienne: 1651, 1655

Colladon, Esaie: 1651, 1655, 1659, 1663, 1667, 1671

Chabrey, Esaie: 1652, 1656, 1660, 1664, 1668

Pictet, Andre: 1652, 1656, 1660, 1664, 1668

De la Maisonneuve, Jaques: 1652, 1656

Trembley, Jean: 1652, 1656

Gallatin, Isaac: 1653, 1657, 1661, 1665

Dufour, Jaques: 1653, 1657

Gallatin, Abraham: 1653, 1657

De la Place, Louis: 1653

Roset, Marc: 1654, 1658, 1662, 1666, 1670, 1674

[1016] AEG, RC 149-199.

Dupan, Jean (or Johan): 1655, 1659, 1663, 1667, 1671, 1675, 1679

De la Rue, Louis: 1657, 1661, 1665, 1669, 1673

Lect, Odet: 1658, 1662, 1683

Fabri, Isaac: 1659, 1663

Liffort, Jean: 1660, 1664

De la Maisonneuve, Gabriel: 1660, 1664, 1668, 1672, 1676, 1680, 1684

Favre, Jacques: 1661

Lullin, Jean: 1661, 1665, 1669, 1673

Grenus, Jacques: 1663, 1667, 1671, 1675, 1679, 1683, 1687, 1691, 1695

Buisson, Jean: 1665

Andrion, Jacob: 1666, 1670

De Normandie, Michel: 1667, 1671, 1675, 1679, 1687, 1691, 1695

Rocca, Estienne: 1668, 1672, 1676, 1680, 1684, 1688, 1692, 1696

Trembley, Louis: 1669, 1673, 1677

De Chappeaurouge, Ami: 1669, 1673, 1677, 1681, 1685, 1689

Butini, Gabriel: 1672, 1676, 1680

Trembley, Michel: 1672, 1676, 1680, 1684, 1688, 1692, 1696

Fabri, Pierre: 1674, 1678, 1682, 1686, 1690, 1694, 1698

Sarazin, Jean: 1675, 1679, 1683

Gallatin, Ezechiel: 1677, 1681, 1685, 1689, 1693, 1697

De la Rive, Jean Jacques: 1677, 1681, 1685, 1689, 1693, 1697

Pictet, Pierre: 1678, 1682, 1686, 1690

Pictet, Jacques: 1678, 1682, 1686, 1690, 1694, 1698

Chabrey, Estienne: 1681, 1685, 1689, 1693

Pan, Augustin: 1682, 1686, 1690, 1694, 1698

Lect, Jean Jacques: 1683

Lefort, Ami:1684, 1688, 1692, 1696

De Normandie, Jean: 1687, 1691, 1695, 1699

Franconis, Jacques: 1687, 1691, 1695

Lullin, Jean Antoine: 1688, 1692, 1696

Mestrezat, Jean Louis: 1693

Sarazin, Pierre: 1694, 1698

Gautier, Pierre: 1697

Lullin, Pierre: 1697

Chouet, Jean Robert: 1699

Perdriau, Pierre: 1699

Buisson, Leonard: 1699

Select Bibliography

Manuscript Sources:

Archives d'État de Genève, Geneva, Switzerland

Registers of the Company of Pastors of Geneva

2	Minutes of the meetings of the Company of Pastors, July 1553 – 9 September 1598
5	Minutes of the meetings of the Company of Pastors, 3 February 1604 – 27 December 1611
6	Minutes of the meetings of the Company of Pastors, 10 January 1612 – 31 December 1619
8	Minutes of the meetings of the Company of Pastors, 7 January 1625 – 30 December 1642
9	Minutes of the meetings of the Company of Pastors, 6 January 1643 – 26 December 1651
10	Minutes of the meetings of the Company of Pastors, 2 January 1652 – 29 December 1657
11	Minutes of the meetings of the Company of Pastors, 1 January 1658 – 22 August 1665
12	Minutes of the meetings of the Company of Pastors, 25 August 1665 – 8 September 1671
13	Minutes of the meetings of the Company of Pastors, 15 September 1671 – 15 August 1679

15	Minutes of the meetings of the Company of Pastors, 14 December 1683 – 14 January 1687
16	Minutes of the meetings of the Company of Pastors, 1 April 1687 – 28 March 1690

Registers of the Consistory of Geneva

56	Minutes of the meetings of the Consistory, 13 January 1648 – 29 December 1653
57	Minutes of the meetings of the Consistory, 12 January 1654 – 11 November 1658
128	Minutes of the meetings of the Consistory, 4 October 1904 – 6 February 1906

Registers of the Small Council of Geneva

148	Minutes of the meetings of the Small Council, 7 January 1649 – 5 January 1650
152	Minutes of the meetings of the Small Council, 2 January 1653 – 31 December 1653
153	Minutes of the meetings of the Small Council, 1 January 1654 – 11 July 1654
155	Minutes of the meetings of the Small Council, 7 January 1655 – 7 January 1656
169	Minutes of the meetings of the Small Council, 3 January 1669 – 5 January 1670

Civil Directories (Répertoires d'état Civil)

1.4	Directory of Baptisms of the city from A to Z, 1614-25

1.8	Directory of Baptisms of the city from A to Z, 1664-75
3.5 bis	Copy of the directory of deaths of the city from A to Z, 1652-1676
3.6	Directory of deaths of the city from A to Z, 1676-1702
Notices	
23 March 1660	Notice of evening prayers for the city of Geneva

Bibliothèque Publique et Universitaire de Genève, Geneva, Switzerland

MS Lullin	
54	Correspondence of Antoine Leger and annexes; letters of Cornelius Haga, 1619-1661
MS FR	
468	Copy of the Helvetic Formula Consensus, 1679
486	Letters addressed to Jean-Alphonse Turrettini, 1646-1737

Printed Primary Sources:

Alexander, A., "The Decrees of God," in *Theological Essays Reprinted from the Princeton Review* (New York, NY and London, 1846), pp. 60-79.

Aquinas, T., *Summa Theologica* (3 vols, London, 1955).

Aristotle, "Nichomachean Ethics," in T. Taylor (ed.), *The Works of Aristotle Vol. IV: The Rhetoric, Poetic and Nichomachean Ethics*, Thomas Taylor Series, 22 (6 vols, Frome, 2002), pp. 231-454.

Beardslee, J. (ed.), *Reformed Dogmatics, Seventeenth Century Reformed Theology: The Writings of Wollebius, Voetius, and Turretin* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1977).

_____, *The Doctrine of Scripture* (trans. J. Beardslee, Grand Rapids, MI, 1981).

Calvin, J., *Institution de la Religion Chrestienne* (4 vols, Geneva, 1566).

_____, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion* (trans. H. Beveridge, Peabody, MA, 2008).

Calvino, J., *Institutio Christianae Religionis* (4 vols, Geneva, 1559).

Descartes, R., "Letter to Father Dinet," in *Idem*., *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes* (2 vols, trans. J. Cottingham, *et al*., Cambridge, 1994).

Hodge, C., *Systematic Theology* (3 vols, New York, NY, London, and Edinburgh, 1872-3).

Hyperius, A., *The Practis of Preaching, Otherwise Called the Pathway to the Pulpit* (trans. J. Ludham, London, 1577).

Lowes Edinburgh Magazine and Protestant and Educational Journal (Edinburgh, 1846-7).

Luther, M., *An Open Letter to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation Concerning the Reform of the Christian Estate* (Wittenberg, 1520).

_____, "Disputation Against Scholastic Theology," in T. Lull and W. R. Russell (eds), *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings* (Minneapolis, MN, 1989), pp. 1-7.

Pictet, B., "Funeral Oration of Benedict Pictet Concerning the Life and Death of Francis Turretin: Delivered on the Third Day of November of the Year 1687," in J. Dennison (ed.), *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* (3 vols, Phillipsburg, NJ, 1992), III pp. 659-76.

Rijssenius, L., *Summa Theologiae Elencticae* (Edinburgh, 1692).

Spanheim, F., *Disputatio Theologica de Gratia Universali* (Leiden, 1644).

_____, *Disputationum Theologicarum Syntagma* (2 vols, Geneva, 1652).

Turretin, B., *Défense de la fidelité des traductions de la S. Bible faites à Genève: opposée au livre de Pierre Coton intitulé Genève plagiaire* (Geneva, 1618).

_____, *Index librorum prohibitorum et expurgatorum* (Geneva, 1619).

_____, *Recueil des pièces concernants la doctrine et practique romaine sur la deposition des rois et subversion de leur views et estats, qui s'en ensuit: le tout tiré d'actes et escrits authentiques* (Geneva, 1627).

Turretin, F., *The True Christian Altar and Sacrifice: A Sermon on Heb. Xiii* (London, 1715).

Turretin, J. A., "The Speech of Mr Turrettine, Rector of the Academy at Geneva, made to the Lesser Council for Abolishing the Subscription to the Formula Consensus," in S. Chandler, *The Case of Subscription to Explanatory Articles of Faith, as a Qualification for Admission into the Christian Ministry* (London, 1757).

Turrettini, F., *Predicatien over verscheide texten der H. Schriftuur gedaan door Francois Turrettin* (Utrecht, 1678).

_____, *Vier uytgeleesene predicatien over verscheydene texten der H. Schriftuur, wegens den staat van Godts Kerke* (Amsterdam, 1696).

_____, *Sermons sur divers passages de l'Ecriture Sainte* (Geneva, 1676).

_____, *Recueil de sermons sur divers texts de l'Ecriture Sainte* (Geneva, 1686).

_____, *De Satisfactione Christi Disputationes cum inidicibus necessariis* (Leiden, 1696).

_____, *The Tyranny of the Church of Rome* (trans. T. Rankin, London, 1820).

Turrettino, F., *Francisci Turrettini Opera* (4 vols, New York, NY, 1947-8).

Turretinus, F., "De satisfactione Christi disputationes, cum indicibus necessaries. Adjectae sunt ejusdem duae disputationes: (a) De circulo pontificio. (b) De concordia Jacobi et Pauli in articulo justificationis" (Geneva, 1666).

_____, "De Libro Vitae," (Geneva, 1667).

_____, "Quae Prior est de Scripturae Sacrae Auctoritate adversus Pontificos," (Geneva, 1671).

_____, "De bonorum operum necessitate" (Geneva, 1673).

_____, "De Tribus Testibus Coelestibus, ex 1 Joann. V, 7," (Geneva, 1674).

_____, "De Spiritu, Aqua et Sanguine in Terra Testantibus, ex 1 Joann. V, 8," (Geneva, 1676).

_____, "De Baptismo Nubis et Maris, ex 1 Cor. X, 1, 2 (Geneva, 1677).

_____, “De Manna, ex 1 Cor. X, 3,” (Geneva, 1678).

_____, “De Petro Christo, ex 1 Cor. X, 4,” (Geneva, 1681).

_____, “De necessaria secessione nostra ab Ecclesia Romana et impossibili cum ea syncretismo. Accessit ejusdem disputationum miscellanearum decas” (Geneva, 1687).

_____, *Institutio Theologiae Elencticae* (3 vols, Geneva, 1687-9).

_____, “De Serpente Aeneo,” (Geneva, 1688).

_____, *Turrettini Theologiae* (4 vols, Leyden and Utrecht, 1696).

_____, *Francisci Turrettini Opera* (4 vols, Edinburgh, 1847-8).

Willson, J. (ed.), *Turretin on the Atonement of Christ* (New York, NY, 1859).

Winburn, R. (ed.), *Francis Turretin’s Seventh Disputation: Whether it Can be Proved the Pope of Rome is the Antichrist* (trans. K Bubb, Forestville, CA, 1999).

Secondary Sources:

Ahlstrom, S., “The Scottish Philosophy and American Theology,” *Church History*, 24 (1955), pp. 257-72.

Aldis, H., *A List of Books Printed in Scotland Before 1700, including those Printed Furth of the Realm of Scottish Booksellers with Brief Notes on the Printers and Stationers* (Edinburgh, 1904).

Althaus, P., *Die Prinzipien der deutschen reformierten Dogmatik im Zeitalter der aristotelischen Scholastik* (Leipzig, 1914).

Anjubault, M. and H. Chardon (eds), *Recueil des pieces inédits pour servir à l’histoire de la Réforme et de la Ligue dans le Maine* (Le Mans, 1867).

Armstrong, B., *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth Century France* (Madison, WI, 1969).

_____, “Geneva and the Theology and Politics of French Calvinism: The Embarrassment of the 1588 Edition of the Bible of the Pastors and Professors of Geneva,” in W. Neuser (ed.), *Calvinus Ecclesiae Genevensis Custos* (Frankfurt, 1982), pp. 113-33.

Aston, N., *Christianity and Revolutionary Europe, 1750-1830* (Cambridge, 2002).

Avis, P., "Moses and the Magistrate: A Study in the Rise of Protestant Legalism," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 26 (1975), pp. 149-72.

Bagchi, D., "Sic et Non: Luther and Scholasticism," in C. Trueman and R. S. Clark (eds), *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Milton Keynes, 1999), pp. 3-15.

Balserak, J., "The Authority of Scripture and Tradition in Calvin's Lectures on the Prophets", in H. Parish, *et al.* (eds), *The Search for Authority in Reformation Europe* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 29-48.

Bangs, C., *Arminius: A Study in the Dutch Reformation* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1985).

Barnett, S. J., *The Enlightenment and Religion: The Myths of Modernity* (Manchester, 2003).

Barth, K., *Church Dogmatics Volume 2—The Doctrine of God Part I* (4 vols, G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, eds; Edinburgh, 1957).

Bayle, P., *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique* (16 vols, Paris, 1820).

Beach, J. M., "Preaching Predestination—An Examination of Francis Turretin's Sermon *De L'Affermissement de la Vocation et de l'election du Fidele*," *Mid-America Journal of Theology*, 21 (2010), pp. 133-147.

Beck, A., "Melanchthonian Thought in Gisbertus Voetius' Scholastic Doctrine of God," in M. Wisse, *et al*. (eds), *Scholasticism Reformed: Essays in Honor of Willem J. van Asselt* (Leiden, 2010), pp. 107-26.

Beeke, J., "The Order of the Divine Decrees at the Genevan Academy: From Bezan Supralapsarianism to Turretinian Infralapsarianism," in J. Roney and M. Klauber (eds), *The Identity of Geneva: The Christian Commonwealth, 1564-1864* (London, 1998), pp. 57-75.

Benedict, P., *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism* (London, 2002).

Bennett, J., *A Philosophical Guide to Conditionals* (Oxford, 2003).

Bierma, L. D., "Law and Grace in Ursinus' Doctrine of the Natural Covenant: A Reappraisal," in C. Trueman and R. S. Clark (eds), *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Milton Keynes, 1999), pp. 96-110.

_____, *An Introduction to the Heidelberg Catechism: Sources, History, and Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2005).

Bizer, E., *Frühorthodoxie und Rationalismus* (Zurich, 1963).

_____, "Reformed Orthodoxy and Cartesianism," *Journal for Theology and the Church*, 2 (1965), pp. 20-4.

Blockmans, W., "The Formation of a Political Union, 1300-1600," in C. Blom and E. Lamberts (eds), *History of the Low Countries* (New York, NY, 1999), pp. 55-140.

Bonner, G., "Pelagius," *ODNB*, OUP, 2004 [acc. 26 August 2014: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21784.

Borgeaud, C., *Histoire de l'Université de Genève* (4 vols, Geneva, 1900).

Bostock, D., *Aristotle's Ethics* (Oxford, 2000).

Bouwsma, W. J., *John Calvin: A Sixteenth Century Portrait* (New York, NY and Oxford, 1988).

Brandt, G., *An Abridgement of Gerard Brandt's History of the Reformation in the Low-Countries: Containing All that is Curious in that Most Valuable Work* (London, 1725).

Bruce, J. E., *Rights in the Law: The Importance of God's Free Choices in the thought of Francis Turretin* (Göttingen, 2013).

Burnett, A., "Contributors to the Reformed Tradition," in D. Whitford (ed.), *Reformation and Early Modern Europe: A Guide to Research* (Kirksville, MO, 2008), pp. 25-56.

Clarke, D., *Descartes: A Biography* (Cambridge, 2006).

Cohn, H., "The Territorial Princes in Germany's Second Reformation, 1559-1622," in M. Prestwich (ed.), *International Calvinism, 1541-1715* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 135-65.

Coffey, J. and P. C. H. Lim, "Introduction," in *Idem.* (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (New York, NY, 2008), pp. 1-15.

Collinson, P., "England and International Calvinism, 1558-1640," in M. Prestwich (ed.), *International Calvinism, 1541-1715* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 197-223.

_____, "England," in B. Scribner, *et al.* (eds), *The Reformation in National Context* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 80-94.

_____, "Antipuritanism," in J. Coffey and P. C. H. Lim (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (New York, NY, 2008), pp. 19-33.

Connor, P., *Huguenot Heartland: Montauban and Southern French Calvinism During the Wars of Religion* (Aldershot, 2002).

_____, "Geneva in the Centre? The Challenge of the Local Church Orders," in S. Barker (ed.), *Revisiting Geneva: Robert Kingdon and the Coming of the French Wars of Religion* (St Andrews, 2012), pp. 23-36.

Cooper, J. M., "Political Animals and Civil Friendship," in R. Kraut and S. Skultety (eds), *Aristotle's Politics: Critical Essays* (Lanham, MD, 2005), pp. 65-89.

Costello, W., *The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1958).

Crisp, O., *Retreiving Doctrine: Explorations in Reformed Theology* (Milton Keynes, 2010).

_____, *Deviant Calvinism: Broadening Reformed Theology* (Minneapolis, MN, 2014).

Cross, R., *Duns Scotus* (Oxford, 1999).

_____, *The Medieval Christian Philosophers: An Introduction* (New York, NY, 2014).

_____, and E. Livingstone (eds), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (3rd Edition, Oxford, 2005).

Daniel, D., "Calvinism in Hungary: The Theological and Ecclesiastical Transition to the Reformed Faith," in A. Pettegree, *et al.* (eds), *Calvinism in Europe, 1540-1620* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 205-30.

Daniell, D., *The Bible in English: Its History and Influence* (New Haven, CT and London, 2003).

Dawson, J., "Calvinism and the Gaidhealtachd in Scotland," in A. Pettegree, *et al.* (eds), *Calvinism in Europe, 1540-1620* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 231-53.

_____, *John Knox* (Llandysul, 2015).

de Boer, E., "The Presence and Participation of Laypeople in the *Congrégations* of the Company of Pastors in Geneva," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 35 (2004), pp. 651-70.

dé Budé, E., *Vie de François Turrettini, Theologien Genevois, 1623-1687* (Lausanne, 1871).

_____, *Vie de Jacob Vernet, theologien genevois (1698-1789)* (Lausanne, 1893).

Dennison, J., "The Life and Career of Francis Turretin," in *Idem*. (ed.), *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* (3 vols, Phillipsburg, NJ, 1992), III pp. 636-48.

_____, "The Twilight of Scholasticism: Francis Turretin at the Dawn of the Enlightenment," in C. Trueman and R. S. Clark (eds), *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Milton Keynes, 1999), pp. 244-55.

Donnelly, J., *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace* (Leiden, 1967).

Drummond, A., *The Kirk and the Continent* (Edinburgh, 1956).

Duffy, E., "*Correspondence Fraternelle*: the SPCK, the SPG, and the Churches of Switzerland in the War of the Spanish Succession," in D. Baker (ed.), *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c1500-1750,* Studies in Church History, 2 (Oxford, 1979), pp. 251-80.

Duke, A., "The Ambivalent Face of Calvinism in the Netherlands, 1561-1618," in M. Prestwich (ed.), *International Calvinism, 1541-1715* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 109-34.

_____, *Reformation and Revolt in the Low Countries* (London, 1990).

_____, "Perspectives on International Calvinism," in A. Pettegree, *et al.* (eds), *Calvinism in Europe, 1540-1620* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 1-20.

Emerson, R., "Scottish Universities in the Eighteenth Century, 1690-1800," in J. Leith (ed.), *Facets of Education in the Eighteenth Century*, Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century, 167 (Oxford, 1977), pp. 453-74.

Evans, R. J. W., *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy, 1550-1700: An Interpretation* (Oxford, 1979).

_____, "Calvinism in East Central Europe: Hungary and Her Neighbours," in M. Prestwich (ed.), *International Calvinism, 1541-1715* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 167-96.

Fesko, J. V., *Beyond Calvin: Union with Christ and Justification in Early Modern Reformed Theology (1517-1700)* (Göttingen, 2012).

Fisher, S., "Pierre Gassendi," in E. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2014) [acc. 2 November 2015: http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/gassendi/].

Ford, J., "Preaching in the Reformed Tradition," in L. Taylor (ed.), *Preachers and People in the Reformations and Early Modern Period* (Leiden, 2001).

Gaberel, J., *Histoire de L'Église de Genève depuis le Commencement de la Réformation jusqu'en 1815* (3 vols, Geneva, 1853).

_____, *Voltaire et les Genevois* (Paris, 1857).

Galiffe, J. A., *Notices Généalogiques sur les Familles Genevoises, Depuis les Premiers Temps jusqu'a nos Jours* (7 vols, Genève, 1831).

Gamble, R., "Switzerland: Triumph and Decline," in W. S. Reid (ed.), *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1982), pp. 55-71.

Ganoczy, A., "Calvin's Life," in D. K. McKim (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to John Calvin* (New York, NY, 2004), pp. 3-24.

Gargett, G., *Jacob Vernet, Geneva and the Philosophes* (Oxford, 1995).

Garside, P., "Literature in the Marketplace: The Rise of the Scottish Literary Market," in B. Bell (ed.), *The Edinburgh History of the Book in Scotland* (4 vols, Edinburgh, 2007), III pp. 203-77.

Gautier, J. A., *Histoire de Genève* (2 vols, Lyons, 1730).

Godfrey, W. R., "John Hales' Good-Night to John Calvin," in C. Trueman and R. S. Clark (eds), *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Milton Keynes, 1999), pp. 165-80.

Good, J., *History of the Swiss Reformed Church Since the Reformation* (Philadelphia, PA, 1913).

Goodare, J., "Scotland," in B. Scribner, *et al.* (eds), *The Reformation in National Context* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 95-110.

Gorski, P., *The Disciplinary Revolution: Calvinism and the Rise of the State in Early Modern Europe* (Chicago, IL, 2003).

Grabill, S. J., "Natural Law and the Noetic Effects of Sin: The Faculty of Reason in Francis Turretin's Theological Anthropology," *Westminster Theological Journal*, 67 (2005), pp. 261-79.

_____, *Rediscovering the Natural Law in Reformed Theological Ethics* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2006).

Graham, G., "Philosophy," in J. Webster, *et al.* (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Systematic Theology* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 511-26.

Grell, O. P., "The Attraction of Leiden University for English Students of Medicine and Theology, 1590-1642," in R. Todd and C. Barfoot (eds), *The Great Emporium: The Low Countries as a Cultural Crossroads in the Renaissance and the Eighteenth Century* (Amsterdam, 1992), pp. 83-104.

_____, *Brethren in Christ: A Calvinist Network in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge, 2011).

Hall, B., "Calvin Against the Calvinists," in G. E. Duffield (ed.), *John Calvin* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1966), pp. 19-37.

_____, *Humanists and Protestants 1500-1900* (Edinburgh, 1990).

Headley, J. M., *et al.* (eds), *Confessionalization in Europe, 1550-1700: Essays in Honor of Bodo Nischan* (Aldershot, 2004).

Helm, P., *Calvin and the Calvinists* (Edinburgh, 1982).

_____, *John Calvin's Ideas* (Oxford and New York, NY, 2004).

_____, "Francis Turretin and Jonathan Edwards on Contingency and Necessity," in J. Balserak and R. Snoddy (eds), *Learning from the Past: Essays on Reception, Catholicity and Dialogue in Honour of Anthony N. S. Lane* (London, 2015), pp. 163-78.

Henderson, D. G., *Religious Life in Seventeenth-Century Scotland* (Cambridge, 1937).

Hendrix, S., "Luther," in D. Bagchi and D. Steinmetz (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 39-56.

Heppe, H., *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformirten Kirche Deutschlands, Schriften zur reformirten Theologie* (Elberfeld, 1860).

Heyd, M., *Between Orthodoxy and the Enlightenment: Jean-Robert Chouet and the Introduction of Cartesian Science in the Academy* (London, 1982).

Heyer, H., *Catalogue des Thèses de Théologies Soutenues a l'Academie de Genève* (Geneva, 1898).

_____, *L'Église de Genève: Equisse Historique de son Organisation suivie de ses Diverses Constitutions de la liste de ses Pasteurs et Professeurs et d'une Table Biographique* (Geneva, 1909).

Hornbeck, J. P., *What is a Lollard? Dissent and Belief in Late Medieval England* (Oxford, 2010).

Houston, R. A., *Literacy in Early Modern Europe* (Harlow, 2002).

Hsia, R. P., *Social Discipline in the Reformation: Central Europe 1550-1750* (London, 1989).

Hughes, A., "Public Disputations, Pamphlets and Polemic," *History Today*, 41 (1991), pp. 27-33.

Hughes, P., *The Registers of the Company of Pastors of Geneva in the Time of Calvin* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1966).

Iribarren, I., *Durandus of St Pourcain: A Dominican Theologian in the Shadow of Aquinas* (Oxford, 2005).

Israel, J., *The Dutch Revolt: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall, 1477-1806* (Oxford, 1995).

James, F., "Peter Martyr Vermigli: At the Crossroads of Late Medieval Scholasticism, Christian Humanism and Resurgent Augustinianism," in C. Trueman and R. S. Clark (eds), *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Milton Keynes, 1999), pp. 62-78.

Janz, D., "Late Medieval Theology," in D. Bagchi and D. Steinmetz (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 5-14.

Jenkins, D. L., *Saumur Redux: Josué de la Place and the Question of Adam's Sin* (Harleston, 2008).

Jenkins, P., *The Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity* (New York, NY, 2002).

_____, *The Lost History of Christianity: The Thousand-Year Golden Age of the Church in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia—And How it Died* (New York, NY, 2008).

Kavka, F., "Bohemia," in B. Scribner, *et al*. (eds), *The Reformation in National Context* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 131-54.

Keizer, G., *François Turrettini: Sa Vie et Ses Oeuvres et le Consensus* (Lausanne, 1900).

Kendall, R. T., *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (New York, NY, 1979).

_____, "The Puritan Modification of Calvin's Theology," in W. S. Reid (ed.), *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1982), pp. 199-214.

Kennedy, E. M., "From Pessimism to Optimism: Francis Turretin and Charles Hodge on 'The Last Things,'" in J. D. Klunder and R. L. Gasero (eds), *Servant Gladly: Essays in Honor of John W. Beardslee III* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1989), pp. 104-116.

Kerr, F., "Thomas Aquinas," in G. Evans (ed.), *The Medieval Theologians* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 201-20.

Kingdon, R., *Geneva and the Consolidation of the French Protestant Movement 1564-72* (Geneva, 1967).

_____, "Social Welfare in Calvin's Geneva," *American Historical Review*, 76 (1971), pp. 50-69.

_____, "Calvinism and Social Welfare," *Calvin Theological Journal*, 17 (1982), pp. 212-30.

_____, "Calvin and the Family: The Work of the Consistory of Geneva," in R. Gamble (ed.), *Articles on Calvin and Calvinism 3: Calvin's Work in Geneva* (New York, NY and London, 1992), pp. 93-106.

_____, "The Geneva Consistory in the Time of Calvin," in A. Pettegree, *et al.* (eds), *Calvinism in Europe, 1540-1620* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 21-34.

_____, *Adultery and Divorce in Calvin's Geneva* (London, 1995).

_____, (ed.), *Registers of the Consistory of Geneva in the Time of Calvin* (1 vol., Grand Rapids, MI, 2000).

_____, *Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion in France, 1555-1563*, Cahiers d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 82 (Geneva, 2007).

Kirk, J., "The Influence of Calvinism on the Scottish Reformation," *Records of the Scottish Church History Society*, 18 (1974), pp. 157-79.

Klauber, M., "The Helvetic Formula Consensus (1675): An Introduction and Translation," *Trinity Journal*, 11 (1990), pp. 103-23.

_____, "Reason, Revelation, and Cartesianism: Louis Tronchin and Enlightened Orthodoxy in Late Seventeenth Century Geneva," *Church History*, 59 (1990), pp. 326-39.

_____, "Jean-Alphonse Turretini and the Abrogation of the Formula Consensus in Geneva," *Westminster Theological Journal*, 53 (1991), pp. 325-38.

_____, "Francis Turretin on Biblical Accommodation: Loyal Calvinist or Reformed Scholastic?", *Westminster Theological Journal*, 55 (1993), pp. 73-86.

_____, *Between Reformed Scholasticism and Pan-Protestantism: Jean-Alphonse Turrettin (1671-1737) and Enlightened Orthodoxy at the Academy of Geneva* (London, 1994).

_____, "Reformed Scholasticism in Transition: Benedict Pictet and Enlightened Orthodoxy at the Academy of Geneva," in W. F. Graham (ed.), *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives* (Kirkville, MO, 1994), pp. 93-118.

_____, "Theological Transition in Geneva: From Jean-Alphonse Turretin to Jacob Vernet," in C. Trueman and R. S. Clark (eds), *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Milton Keynes, 1999), pp. 256-70.

_____, "The Uniqueness of Christ in Post-Reformation Reformed Theology: From Francis Turretin to Jean-Alphonse Turretin" in J. Ballor, *et al*. (eds), *Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism: Studies in Honor of Richard A. Muller on the Maturation of a Theological Tradition* (Leiden, 2013), pp. 699-710.

Knudson, R., "Calvinism as a Cultural Force", in W.S. Reid (ed.), *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1982), pp. 13-29.

Kneidel, G., "*Are Praedicandi*: Theories and Practice," in P. McCullough, *et al.* (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 3-20.

Krahn, C., *Dutch Anabaptism: Origin, Spread, Life and Thought (1450-1600)* (The Hague, 1968).

Kristeller, P. O., *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic and Humanist Strains* (New York, NY, 1961).

Kusukawa, S., "Melanchthon," in D. Bagchi and D. Steinmetz (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 57-67.

Labrousse, É., "Calvinism in France, 1598-1685," in M. Prestwich (ed.), *International Calvinism, 1541-1715* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 285-314.

Laval, S., *A Compendious History of the Reformation, and of the Reformed Churches of France. From the First Beginnings of the Reformation, to the Repealing of the Edict of Nantz with an Account of the Late Perfection of the French Protestants under Louis XIV. Extracted out of the best Authorities* (7 vols, London, 1737-43).

le Fort, C., *Le Livre du Recteur, 1559-1859: Catalogue des Étudiants de l'Academie de Genève de 1559 à 1859* (Geneva, 1860).

Levi, P., *The English Bible: From Wycliffe to William Barnes* (Worthing, 1985).

Lewis, G., "Calvinism in Geneva in the Time of Calvin and of Beza (1541-1605)," in M. Prestwich (ed.), *International Calvinism, 1541-1715* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 39-70.

_____, "The Geneva Academy," in A. Pettegree, *et al.* (eds), *Calvinism in Europe, 1540-1620* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 35-63.

Lindberg, C., *The European Reformations* (1st Edition, Oxford, 1996).

Loetscher, L., *Facing the Enlightenment and Pietism: Archibald Alexander and the Founding of Princeton Theological Seminary* (Westport, CT and London, 1993).

Lord, C., *Aristotle's Politics* (Chicago, IL, 2013).

Lotz-Heumann, U., "Confessionalization," in D. Whitford (ed.), *Reformation and Early Modern Europe: A Guide to Research* (Kirksville, MO, 2008), pp. 137-57.

Low, S. (ed.), *The Catalogue of Books Published from January, 1835, to January, 1863* (Millwood, NY, 1976).

Lull T., "Luther the Man," in T. Lull and W. R. Russell (eds), *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings* (Minneapolis, MN, 1989).

Lynch, M., "Calvinism in Scotland, 1559-1638," in M. Prestwich (ed.), *International Calvinism, 1541-1715* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 225-55.

MacCulloch, D., *The Reformation* (New York, NY, 2004).

Maag, K., *Seminary or University? The Genevan Academy and Reformed Higher Education, 1560-1620* (Aldershot, 1995).

_____, "Preaching Practice: Reformed Students' Sermons," *Dutch Review of Church History*, 85 (2005), pp. 133-46.

_____, "From Professors to Pastors: The Convoluted Careers of Jean Diodati and Théodore Tronchin," in J. Ballor, *et al*. (eds), *Church and School in Early Modern Protestantism: Studies in Honor of Richard A. Muller on the Maturation of a Theological Tradition* (Leiden, 2013), pp. 243-53.

Manetsch, S., *Theodore Beza and the Quest for Peace in France: 1572-1598* (Leiden, 2000).

_____, *Calvin's Company of Pastors: Pastoral Care and the Emerging Reformed Church, 1536-1609* (Oxford, 2013).

Mann, A., *The Scottish Book Trade 1500-1720* (East Linton, 2000).

Marenbon, J., *Later Medieval Philosophy: An Introduction* (London, 1987).

Marnef, G., "The Changing Face of Calvinism in Antwerp," in A. Pettegree, *et al.* (eds), *Calvinism in Europe, 1540-1620* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 143-59.

Marshall, R., *John Knox* (Edinburgh, 2000).

McComish, W., *The Epigones* (Allison Park, 1989).

McGrade, A. S., "Henry of Ghent," in A. S. McGrade (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2003), p. 355.

_____, "Bonaventure," in A. S. McGrade (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2003), p. 355.

McGrath, A., *In the Beginning: The Story of the King James and How it Changed a Nation, a Language, and a Culture* (New York, NY, 2001).

_____, *Christianity's Dangerous Idea: The Protestant Revolution—a History from the Sixteenth Century to the Twenty-First* (New York, NY, 2007).

McKim, D. K., *Introducing the Reformed Faith: Biblical Revelation, Christian Tradition, Contemporary Significance* (Louisville, KY, 2001).

McLeod, H. and W. Ustorf (eds), *The Decline of Christendom in Western Europe, 1750-2000* (Cambridge, 2003).

McNair, P., *Peter Martyr in Italy: An Anatomy of Apostasy* (Oxford, 1967).

McNutt, J. P., "Hesitant Steps: Acceptance of the Gregorian Calendar in Eighteenth-Century Geneva," *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture*, 75 (2006), pp. 544-64.

_____, *Calvin Meets Voltaire: The Clergy of Geneva in the Age of Enlightenment, 1685-1798* (Farnham, 2013).

Mechie, S., "The Theological Climate in Early Eighteenth Century Scotland," in D. Shaw (ed.), *Reformation and Revolution: Essays Presented to the Very Reverend Principal Emeritus Hugh Watt, D.D., D.Litt., on the Sixtieth Anniversary of his Ordination* (Edinburgh, 1967), pp. 258-72.

Mentzer, R. A., "Fashioning Reformed Identity in Early Modern France," in J. M. Headley, *et al.* (eds), *Confesionalization in Europe, 1555-1700: Essays in Honor and Memory of Bodo Nischan* (Aldershot, 2004), pp. 243-55.

Metzger, B. M., "The Geneva Bible of 1560," *Theology Today* 17 (1960), pp. 339-52.

_____, *The Bible in Translation: Ancient and English Versions* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2001).

Miller, V. C., *The Lambeth Articles: Doctrinal Development and Conflict in 16th Century England*, Latimer Studies 44-5 (Oxford, 1994).

Milton, A., *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylin* (Manchester, 2007).

Moltmann, J., "Prädestination und Heilsgeschichte bei Moyse Amyraut," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 65 (1954), pp. 270-303.

Monter, W., *Calvin's Geneva* (New York, NY, 1967).

Muller, R., *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1985).

_____, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1986).

_____, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725* (4 vols, Grand Rapids, MI, 1987-93).

_____, "'Calvin and the Calvinists': Assessing Continuities and Discontinuities Between the Reformation and Orthodoxy," *Calvin Theological Journal*, 30 (1995), pp. 347-75.

_____, "'Calvin and the Calvinists': Assessing Continuities and Discontinuities Between the Reformation and Orthodoxy," *Calvin Theological Journal*, 31 (1996), pp. 125-60.

_____, "The Use and Abuse of a Document: Beza's *Tabula Praedestinationis*, the Bolsec Controversy, and the Origins of Reformed Orthodoxy," in C. Trueman and R. S. Clark (eds), *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Milton Keynes, 1999), pp. 33-61.

_____, *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition* (New York, NY, 2000).

_____, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York, NY, 2003).

_____, *Calvin and the Reformed Tradition: On the Work of Christ and the Order of Salvation* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2012).

Murray, J., "Imputation of Adam's Sin," *Westminster Theological Jounral*, 18-19 (1956), pp. 146-61; 25-44.

Murray, P. R., "Religion," in B. Bell (ed.), *The Edinburgh History of the Book in Scotland* (4 vols, Edinburgh, 2007), III pp. 287-95.

_____, "Education," in B. Bell (ed.), *The Edinburgh History of the Book in Scotland* (4 vols, Edinburgh, 2007), III pp. 324-32.

Naphy, W., "The Renovation of the Ministry in Calvin's Geneva," in A. Pettegree (ed.), *The Reformation of the Parishes: The Ministry and the Reformation in Town and Country* (Manchester and New York, NY, 1993), pp. 113-32.

_____, "The Reformation and the Evolution of Geneva's Schools," in B. Kümin (ed.), *Reformations Old and New: Essays on the Socio-Economic Impact of Religious Change c. 1470-1630* (Aldershot, 1996), pp. 185-202.

_____, "Genevan Diplomacy and Foreign Policy, c. 1535-1560: Balancing on the Edge of the Confederacy," in W. Keiser, *et al.* (eds), *Eidgenössische «Grenzfälle»: Mülhausen und Gef* (Basel, 2001), pp. 189-219.

_____, "Calvin's Geneva," in D. K. McKim (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to John Calvin* (New York, NY, 2004), pp. 25-37.

_____, "Developments in the History of Geneva Since the 1960s," in S. Barker (ed.), *Revisiting Geneva: Robert Kingdon and the Coming of the French Wars of Religion* (St Andrews, 2012), pp. 85-98.

Nicholas, M., *Histoire de l'Ancienne Académie Protestante de Montauban (1598-1659) et de Puylaurens: Publiée sons les auspices de la Faculté de théologie protestante de Montauban* (Montauban, 1885).

Nicole, R., *Moyse Amyraut: A Bibliography* (New York, NY, and London, 1981).

Nischan, B., "The Schools of Brandenburg and the "Second Reformation": Centers of Calvinist Learning and Propaganda," in R. Schnucker (ed.), *Calviniana: Ideas and Influence of Jean Calvin*, Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, 10 (Kirksville, MO, 1988), pp. 215-33.

_____, "Confessionalism and Absolutism: The Case of Brandenburg," in A. Pettegree, *et al*. (eds), *Calvinism in Europe, 1540-1620* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 181-204.

Noll, M., "The Founding of Princeton Seminary," *Westminster Theological Journal*, 42 (1979), pp. 72-110.

_____, *Confessions and Catechisms of the Reformation* (Leicester, 1991).

_____, *The Princeton Theology, 1812-1921: Scripture, Science, and Theological Method from Archibald Alexander to Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2001).

Oberman, H., "Luther and the *Via Moderna:* The Philosophical Backdrop of the Reformation Breakthrough," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 54 (2003), pp. 641-70.

Olson, J., *Calvin and Social Welfare: Deacons and the Bourse Française* (London, 1989).

Otten, W., "Medieval Scholasticism: Past, Present, and Future," *Dutch Review of Church History*, 81 (2001), pp. 275-89.

Ovenden, R., "Dedication," in M. Suarez and H. Woodhuysen (eds), *The Oxford Companion to the Book* (2 vols, Oxford, 2010), II pp. 661-2.

Overfield, J., *Humanism and Scholasticism in Late Medieval Germany* (Princeton, NJ, 1984).

Owens, J., "Aristotle and Aquinas," in N. Kretzmann and E. Stump (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Aquinas* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 38-59.

Packull, W., "An Introduction to Anabaptist Theology," in D. Bagchi and D. Steinmetz (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 194-219.

Parker, T. H. L., "Calvin the Biblical Expositor," in G. E. Duffield (ed.), *John Calvin* (Abingdon, 1966), pp. 176-86.

_____, *John Calvin: A Biography* (London, 1975).

Pelikan, J., *Credo: Historical and Theological Guide to the Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition* (New Haven, CT and London, 2003).

Peter, K., "Hungary," in B. Scribner, *et al*. (eds), *The Reformation in National Context* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 155-167.

Pettegree, A., "Coming to Terms with Victory: The Upbuilding of a Calvinist Church in Holland, 1572-1590," A. Pettegree, *et al*. (eds), *Calvinism in Europe, 1540-1620* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 160-80.

_____, "Confessionalization in North Western Europe," in J. Bahlcke and A. Strohmeyer (eds), *Konfessionalisierung in Ostmitteleuropa: Wirkungen des religiosen Wandels im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert in Staat, Gesellschaft und Kultur* (1999), pp. 105-20.

_____, "The Spread of Calvin's Thought," in D. K. McKim (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to John Calvin* (New York, NY, 2004), pp. 207-24.

_____, *The Book in the Renaissance* (New Haven, CT, 2010).

_____, "Genevan Print and the Coming of the Wars of Religion," in S. Barker (ed.), *Revisiting Geneva: Robert Kingdon and the Coming of the French Wars of Religion* (St Andrews, 2012), pp. 52-70.

Phillips, T. R., "The Dissolution of Francis Turretin's Vision of *Theologia*: Geneva at the End of the Seventeenth Century," in J. B. Roney and M. Klauber (eds), *The Indentity of Geneva: The Christian Commonwealth, 1564-1864* (London, 1998), pp. 77-92.

Presbyterian Church (USA), "The Confessional Nature of the Church," in D. K. McKim (ed.), *Major Themes in the Reformed Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1992), pp. 19-27.

Prestwich, M., "Introduction: The Changing Face of Calvinism," in *Idem*. (ed.), *International Calvinism, 1541-1715* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 1-14.

_____, "Calvinism in France, 1555-1629," in *Idem*. (ed.), *International Calvinism, 1541-1715* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 71-107.

Questier, M., *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580-1625* (Cambridge, 1996).

Quick, J., *Synodicon in Gallia Reformata; or the Acts, Decisions, Decrees, and Canons of those Famous National Councils of the Reformed Churches in France* (2 vols, London, 1692).

Reese, J., "Pitfalls of Prooftexting," *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 13 (1983), pp. 121-3.

Rehnman, S., "Alleged Rationalism: Francis Turretin on Reason," *Calvin Theological Journal*, 37 (2002), pp. 255-69.

_____, "Theistic Metaphysics and Biblical Exegesis: Francis Turretin on the Concept of God," *Religious Studies*, 38 (2002), pp. 167-86.

Reid, W. S., "The Transmission of Calvinism in the Sixteenth Century," in *Idem*. (ed.), *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1982), pp. 33-52.

_____, "Calvin and the Founding of the Academy of Geneva," in R. Gamble (ed.), *Articles of Calvin and Calvinism 3: Calvin's Work in Geneva* (New York, NY, and London, 1992), pp. 237-69.

Reinhard, W., "Reformation, Counter-Reformation, and the Early Modern State: A Reassessment," *Catholic Historical Review*, 75 (1989), pp. 383-404.

_____, "Pressures Towards Confessionalization? Prolegomena to a Theory of Continental Age," in C. S. Dixon (ed.), *The German Reformation* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 172-92.

Rex, R., *Henry VIII and the English Reformation* (2nd Edition, Basingstoke, 2006).

Rex, W., *Essays on Pierre Bayle and Religious Controversy* (The Hague, 1965).

Ridley, J., *John Knox* (Oxford, 1986).

Rogers, J. and D. K. McKim, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach* (San Francisco, CA, 1979).

Rogers, J., "The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible in the Reformed Tradition," in D. K. McKim (ed.), *Major Themes in the Reformed Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1992).

Rogers, M., "Charles Hodge and the Doctrine of Accommodation," *Trinity Journal*, 31 (2010), pp. 225-42.

Rogerson, J., "Biblical Criticism," in R. Coggins and J. Houlden (eds), *The SCM Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (London, 1990), pp. 83-6.

Ryken, P. G., "Scottish Reformed Scholasticism," in C. Trueman and R. S. Clark (eds), *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Milton Keynes, 1999), pp. 196-210.

_____, *Thomas Boston as Preacher of the Fourfold State* (Carlisle, 1999).

Sandeen, E., "The Princeton Theology: One Source of Biblical Literalism in American Protestantism," *Church History*, 31 (1962), pp. 307-21.

_____, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930* (Chicago, IL and London, 1970).

Sanneh, L., *Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture* (Maryknoll, NY, 1989).

_____, *The Changing face of Christianity: Africa, the West, and the World* (New York, NY, 2005).

Schaefer, P., "Protestant 'Scholasticism' at Elizabethan Cambridge: William Perkins and a Reformed Theology of the Heart," in C. Trueman and R. S. Clark (eds), *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Milton Keynes, 1999), pp. 147-64.

Schaff, P., *The Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes* (3 vols, New York, NY, 1877).

Scharlemann, R., *Thomas Aquinas and John Gerhard* (London, 1964).

Schilling, H., "The Reformation and the Rise of the Early Modern State," in J. Tracy (ed.), *Luther and the Modern State in Germany*, Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, 7 (Ann Arbor, MI, 1986), pp. 21-30.

_____, "Confessionalization in the Empire: Religious and Societal Change in Germany Between 1555 and 1620," in H. Schilling (ed.), *Religion, Political Culture and the Emergence of Early Modern Society: Essays in German and Dutch History*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, 50 (New York, NY, 1992), pp. 205-45.

_____, "The Second Reformation—Problems and Issues," in H. Schilling (ed.), *Religion, Political Culture and the Emergence of Early Modern Society: Essays in German and Dutch History*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, 50 (New York, NY, 1992), pp. 247-301.

_____, "Confessional Europe," in T. Bradley, *et al.* (eds), *Handbook of European History 1400-1600* (New York, NY, 1995), pp. 641-81.

Scott, T., *The Articles of the Synod of Dort* (Philadelphia, PA, 1841).

Schmidt, A., *John Calvin and the Calvinist Tradition* (New York, NY, 1960).

Schweitzer, A., "Die Entwickelung des Moralsystems in der reformirten Kirche," in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 23 (Hamburg, 1850), pp. 5-78, 288-327, 554-80.

Senebier, J., *Histoire Litteraire de Genève* (3 vols, Geneva, 1786).

Sigmund, P. E., "Law and Politics," in N. Kretzmann and E. Stump (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Aquinas* (Camrbidge, 1993), pp. 217-31.

Sinnema, D., "The Distinction Between Scholastic and Popular: Andreas Hyperius and Reformed Scholasticism," in C. Trueman and R. S. Clark (eds), *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Milton Keynes, 1999), pp. 127-43.

Skinner, Q., "The Limits of Historical Explanations," *Philosophy*, 41 (1966), pp. 199-215.

Sloan, D., *The Scottish Enlightenment and the American College Ideal* (New York, NY, 1971).

Song, Y., *Theology and Piety in the Reformed Federal Thought of William Perkins and John Preston* (Lewiston, 1998).

Southern, R. W., *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe* (2 vols, Oxford, 1995, 2001).

Speck, W. and L. Billington, "Calvinism in Colonial North America, 1630-1715," in M. Prestwich (ed.), *International Calvinism, 1541-1715* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 257-83.

Spencer, S., "Francis Turretin's Concept of the Covenant of Nature," in W. F. Graham (ed.), *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives* (Kirksville, MO, 1994), pp. 71-91.

Sprunger, K., *Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches of the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden, 1982).

Steinmetz, D. C., *Calvin in Context* (New York, NY, 1995).

_____, "The Scholastic Calvin," in C. Trueman and R. S. Clark (eds), *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Milton Keynes, 1999), pp. 16-30.

_____, *Reformers in the Wings: From Geiler von Kayserberg to Theodore Beza* (Oxford, 2001).

Strehle, S., *Calvinism, Federalism, and Scholasticism: A Study of the Reformed Doctrine of Covenant* (New York, NY, 1988).

Tachin, P., "The Logic of Monergism and Synergism in Francis Turretin's Soteriology," *Kerux: The Journal of Northwest Theological Seminary*, 28 (2013), pp. 33-47.

Tapié, V., *France in the Age of Louis XIII and Richelieu* (Cambridge, 1984).

Taylor, L., "Funeral Sermons and Orations as Religious Propaganda in Sixteenth-century France," in B. Gordon and P. Marshall (eds), *The Place of the Dead: Death and Remembrance in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 224-39.

Taylor, M., "The Conflicting Doctrines of the Scottish Reformation," in D. McRoberts (ed.), *Essays on the Scottish Reformation 1513-1625* (Glasgow, 1962), pp. 245-73.

Torrance, T. F., *Scottish Theology* (Edinburgh, 1996).

Tóth, K., "The Helvetic Reformation in Hungary," in W. S. Reid (ed.), *John Calvin: His Influence in the Western World* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1982), pp. 139-69.

Trueman, C., "A Small Step Towards Rationalism: The Impact of the Metaphysics of Tommaso Campanella on the Theology of Richard Baxter," *Idem*. and R. S. Clark (eds), *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Milton Keynes, 1999), pp. 181-95.

_____, and R. S. Clark, "Introduction," in C. Trueman and R. S. Clark (eds), *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment* (Milton Keynes, 1999), pp. xi-xix.

_____, "Puritanism as Ecumenical Theology," *Dutch Review of Church History*, 81 (2001), pp. 326-36.

_____, "Calvin and Calvinism," in D. K. McKim (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to John Calvin* (New York, NY, 2004), pp. 225-44.

Turrettini, F., *Notice Biographique sur Bénédict Turrettini, Theologien Genevois du XVIIe Siècle* (Geneva, 1871).

Tyacke, N., *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c.1590-1640* (Oxford, 1987).

van Asselt, W. J., "Protestant Scholasticism: Some Methodological Considerations in the Study of its Development," *Dutch Review of Church History*, 81 (2001), pp. 265-74.

_____, "Scholasticism in the Time of High Orthodoxy (ca. 1620-1700)," in W. J. van Asselt, *et al*. (eds), *Introduction to Reformed Scholasticism* (2nd Edition, Grand Rapids, MI, 2011), pp. 132-66.

van Asselt, W. J., *et al*., "Beyond Indifference: An Elenctic Locus on Free Choice by Francesco Turrettini (1623-1687)," in W. J. van Asselt, *et al*. (eds), *Reformed Thought on Freedom: The Concept of Free Choice in the Early Modern Reformed Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2010), pp. 171-200.

van Beeke, P., *The First Female University Student: Anna Maria van Schurman (1636)* (Utrecht, 2007).

van den Belt, H., *The Authority of Scripture in Reformed Theology: Truth and Trust* (Leiden, 2008).

van Deursen, A., "The Dutch Republic, 1588-1780," in C. Blom and E. Lamberts (eds), *History of the Low Countries* (New York, NY, 1999), pp. 143-220.

van Gelderen, M., "Introduction," in M. van Gelderen (ed.), *The Dutch Revolt* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. ix-xxxiii.

van Stam, F. P., *The Controversy Over the Theology of Saumur, 1635-1650: Disrupting Debates Among the Huguenots in Complicated Circumstances* (Amsterdam and Maarssen, 1988).

Voogt, G., "Remonstrant-Counter-Remonstrant Debates: Crafting a Principled Defense of Toleration after the Synod of Dortrecht (1619-1650)," *Church History and Religious Culture*, 89 (2009), pp. 489-524.

Watt, J., *Choosing Death: Suicide and Calvinism in Early Modern Geneva* (Kirksville, MO, 2001).

Wallace, P. J., "The Doctrine of the Covenant in the Elenctic Theology of Francis Turretin," *Mid-Atlantic Theological Journal*, 13 (2002), pp. 143-79.

Wallace, R., *Calvin, Geneva, and the Reformation: A Study of Calvin as Social Reformer, Churchman, Pastor and Theologian* (Edinburgh, 1988).

Weber, H., *Der Einfluss der protestantischen Schulphilosophie auf die orthodox-lutherishe Dogmatik* (Leipzig, 1908).

Weber, M., *Die protestantishe Ethik, und der Geist des Kapitalismus* (Tübingen, 1905).

_____, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York, NY, 1958).

Weber, O., *Foundations of Dogmatics* (2 vols, trans. D. Guder, Grand Rapids, MI, 1981).

Weeks, A., *Valentin Weigel (1533-1588): German Religious Dissenter, Speculative Theorist, and Advocate of Tolerance* (Albany, NY, 2000).

Wendel, F., *Calvin: The Origins and Development of His Thought* (trans. P. Mairet; New York, NY, 1963).

Williams, F., *Index of Dedications and Commentary Verses in English Books Before 1641* (London, 1962).

Wood, J., "The 1861 Spring Resolutions: Charles Hodge, the American Union, and the Dissolution of the Old School Church," *Journal of Church and State*, 47 (2005), pp. 371-87.

Woodbridge, J., *Biblical Authority: A Critique of the Rogers/McKim Proposal* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1982).

_____, and R. Balmer, "The Princetonians and Biblical Authority: An Analysis of the Ernst Sandeen Proposal," in D. Carson and J. Woodbridge (eds), *Scripture and Truth* (Grand Rapids, MI, 1983), pp. 251-79.

Zachman, R., "John Calvin," in C. Lindberg (ed.), *The Reformation Theologians* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 184-97.

_____, *John Calvin as Pastor, Teacher and Theologian: The Shape of His Writings and Thought* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2006).

_____, *Reconsidering John Calvin* (New York, NY, 2012).

Unpublished PhD Theses:

Beach, J. M., "Christ and the Covenant: Francis Turretin's Federal Theology as a Defence of the Doctrine of Grace," Calvin College PhD thesis (2005).

Beardslee, J., "Theological Development at Geneva Under Francis Turretin and Jean-Alphonse Turretin (1648-1737)," Yale University PhD thesis (1956).

Bruce, J. E., "Divine Choice and Natural Law: the Eudokian Ethics of Francis Turretin," Baylor University Ph.D. thesis (2008).

Grohman, D., "The Genevan Reactions to the Saumur Doctrine of Hypothetical Universalism," Knox College PhD thesis (1970).

Jensen, P., "Calvin and Turrettini: A Comparison of their Soteriologies," University of Virginia PhD thesis (1988).

Inman, B., "God Covenanted in Christ: the Unifying Role of Theology Proper in the Systematic Theology of Francis Turretin," Westminster Theological Seminary Ph.D. thesis (2004).

Mackenzie, J., "The Reformed Doctrine of the Will of God in the Theology and Pastoral Practice of Thomas Boston," University of Aberdeen PhD thesis (2011).

Phillips, T., "Francis Turretin's Idea of Theology and Its Bearing Upon His Doctrine of Scripture," Vanderbilt University PhD thesis (1986).

Roddan, J., "'Dayes of Gall and Wormwood': Public Religious Disputation in England, 1558-1626," University of Nottingham PhD thesis (2012).

Spencer, S., "Reformed Scholasticism in Medieval Perspective: Thomas Aquinas and François Turrettini on the Incarnation," Michigan State University PhD thesis (1988).